

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLVIII

DECEMBER, 1933

Number 8

THE VALUE OF HEIDEGGER'S ANALYSIS OF EXISTENCE FOR LITERARY CRITICISM

Heidegger's work *Sein und Zeit*, the first part of which appeared in the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung* 1926, is considered by many to make a most important advance over Kant's critical idealism. In this treatise three trends of modern thought come to a synthesis: Kierkegaard's existential conception of man, Dilthey's and Yorck's interpretation of history, and Husserl's phenomenological method. Although Heidegger does not refer to modern psychological and biological investigation in detail, his point of view may be considered as a serious attempt to lay the philosophical foundation of modern science. While the idealistic philosophy accepted consciousness as the first and basic fact and the objects of consciousness as secondary, the modern philosophy of existence considers consciousness as a secondary factor. For it existence is not given primarily as knowledge of an external world and of other selves, but as a process of handling something, an experience of being together and acting together with others, as "Being-in-the-world."

The significance of this interpretation of existence for literary theory and criticism is to be found in the fact that it offers a theoretical standpoint as a result of which we can more clearly distinguish between classical idealism and the realistic tendencies of the 19th century. The danger of being misled by a mistaken theory of the ethical and esthetic values of classical literature will be greatly minimized by the recognition of the fact that the underlying idealistic philosophy neglects an essential part of the structure of existence. It is impossible to do justice, e. g., to the dramatists of the 19th century, as long as one continues to interpret them from the classical-idealistic point of view. From here, Kleist's *Penthesilea*, the majority of Grillparzer's and Grabbe's

dramas cannot but appear as expressions of pessimistic and melancholic resignation, as a decline from the sublimity of the classical spirit and will to live. From the point of view of the philosophy of existence, however, these poetic products gain in depth and also in philosophical significance. In a recent study of Kleist,¹ Fricke let himself be guided by Kierkegaard's conception of existence and showed that Kleist—far from following the classical idea of universality (as, e. g., Kühnemann² assumes for *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*)—develops towards the unconditioned acceptance of destiny in its entire existential singularity and conditionedness. Also Grillparzer cannot be understood as the poet of resignation and the Schopenhauerian renunciation of the will to live. As is the case for Schopenhauer, life is for him of a decidedly positive character. So it can be shown for Grillparzer's *Sappho* and even more convincingly for the *Goldene Vliesz*, how the poet attempted to root his characters in their natural and human environment, and how even the factor of time begins to assume a modern biological and existential form. Alker's³ exhibition of elements of the baroque and the Josephenian enlightenment as poles of Grillparzer's poetry does not do justice to the poet, because it takes into account only the causal forces which determined Grillparzer's mind, whereas according to the philosophy of existence the final determination has to be considered also, as will be explained below.

Since existence is essentially and primarily "Being-in-the-world" and being-together-with-others, it implies the danger of a domination by others, of accommodation to the average, of *Verfall an das Man*, not only as an effect of deteriorated nature, but necessarily and essentially. This *Verfall*, this yielding to convention and tradition obstructs the immediate contact between the Self and the world. The unessential Ego is dependent on the casual constellation of his environment; it is momentary. The true Self, however, is essentially temporal, i. e., it is qualified in every instant through its initial determination, the *Geworfenheit*, and at the same time through its future potentiality, which in its turn is

¹ Gerhard Fricke. *Gefühl und Schicksal bei Heinrich von Kleist*. Berlin, 1929.

² E. Kühnemann. "Kleist und Kant". *Jahrbuch der Kleist-Gesellschaft*, 1922. Berlin, 1923.

³ E. Alker. *Franz Grillparzer. Ein Kampf um Leben und Kunst*. Marburg, 1930.

founded in the limited character of existence itself. This final determination is achieved through the anticipation of death. In it the Self recognizes its entire potentiality in its limitation, and from this recognition it gains the power to resist the danger of lapsing into the trite conventionalism of the *Man*-attitude. Through the exposition of the contrast of the Ego and the Self (*uneigentliches* and *eigentliches Ich*) the polar tension, which has been recognized as a fundamental condition of artistic creation, is anchored in the structure of existence. Accordingly the poetical process is to be understood and interpreted as an attempt toward liberation from the *Man*-sphere to the sphere of the Self with its immediate relation to reality. As long as time is taken as a succession of moments, polarity can be understood only as momentary tension without extension in time. This extension of polar tension in time, as it most obviously reveals itself in the drama, can from this point of view only be taken as a literary fact. Through Heidegger's analysis of existence as temporality, however, this extension receives a deeper ontological foundation. We have seen before that the Self is characterized by *Geworfenheit* in the past and the anticipation of the finite potentiality, both factors being effective simultaneously in any present instant. If now the poetic process is not the elaboration of a theme in the philological sense, but is to be explained existentially as liberation involving a change from the *Man*-attitude to the Self, this temporality will leave its impression on the inner form of the work of art. It is most clearly noticeable in the drama, although the traditional interpretation with its stress on merely causal motivation conceals this fact.

From the point of view of existence as temporality the scheme of the dramatic process may be analyzed as follows: the starting point and aim of the drama is the present tension, the Self-Ego-tension. This tension is not, however, the abstract, impersonal and therefore unpoetic conflict of individual and society, but the very personal danger faced by the artist of yielding to expedient accommodation, to the situation of the moment, to traditional evaluation, to the commonplace attitude of the *Man*. The poet frees himself from a danger which implies a decline of his personal value by anticipating in his creation the consequences of the *Man*-attitude to which he is liable to yield.

The Goethe interpretation has long applied a similar principle,

when it explained his work as confessions with the effect of liberating the poet from the hold of passions. *Werther*, the monologue of Orestes, and the *Parzenlied* are the classical examples of this type. The principle applied here, however, has a much wider range and is founded in the temporal structure of existence as presence, past (*Gewesenheit*), and future in any moment of true existence.

This temporal structure is of even more importance in what might be termed its historicity. Inasmuch as the drama treats a personal problem, it reflects in some way the *Geworfenheit*, the initial determination of the artist, his personal retrospective conditionedness and his prospective tendency. In Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, the stages of enlightenment, idealism, his despair in idealism, and the final evolution to the resumption of destiny into his Self can be traced. Grabbe's drama can only be understood, if the idealistic starting point and the realistic aim are considered simultaneously in each drama.⁴ On account of this "historicity" any, even the earliest work of art must be interpreted in the light of the whole development of the artist.

Here also the poet's literary development becomes apparent as an urge to continue his creation until the aim of the realization of the Self, inherent in him from the very outset, is attained. Kleist's *Familie Schroffenstein*, e. g., reveals to a certain extent the final solution of the poet's problem, but it remains unsatisfactory on account of the unrelatedness of emotion and destiny; the subsequent works, then, show a continuous progress toward the active resumption of destiny into the Self, and an expansion of the range of sympathy from the limited sphere of individual love to the complex form of national life.

Possibly the typical development of the dramatic work as a whole may be elucidated from this point of view. In general, the following stages may be discerned with tragic poets: (1) the emancipation of the Self from the *Man*-attitude through a desperate anticipation of the last consequences of this attitude. In this stage we find a decided preference for the theme of inescapable fate and of the absolute worthlessness of the world. Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, Schiller's *Räuber*, Kleist's *Familie Schroffenstein*, Grabbe's *Herzog Theodor von Gothland*, Grillparzer's *Ahn-*

⁴ Cp. F. W. Kaufmann. "Die realistische Tendenz in Grabbes Dramen." *Smith College Studies in Modern Languages* XII (1931), No. 4.

frau, Hebbel's early stories and his drama *Judith* are the most striking examples; also the death theme is really not so paradoxical as it first seems to be in the early works of Schnitzler and Hofmannsthal. (2) The second stage is the period of tragedy proper, in which the fight for the realm of values is carried through, as in *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Iphigenie*, *Wallenstein*, etc. (3) In the third period, the Self has found its temporality,—past and future potentiality are effective in every present moment; the Self understands itself as grown through the previous stages. At this point, Schiller's tragedy is supplemented by the sublime; prince Friedrich von Homburg, prince Albrecht in *Agnes Bernauer*, the king in the *Jüdin von Toledo* grow into their essential task. According to this each work is to be evaluated within the stage to which it belongs in the development of the artist.

Existence as essentially Being-in-the-world, being-together-with-others implies that the historicity of the individual work of art reveals through the personal problem of the poet the cultural situation in general. The *Man*-attitude is to a certain extent life in the process of petrification, and the attitude of the Self part of a new form of life. Hebbel's theory of the turning point of history (*Zeitwende*) indicates, although in a rather rational way, a similar idea. The drama, as any real work of art, must, thus, be considered at the time of its origin as a scene of biological adaptation, as a scene of history in the making; historical dramas of real artistic value are not a dramatization of past history, except in the form of expression which includes the historical setting. The transition from heteronomy to autonomy in Lessing's drama, the strife for humanness and freedom in the drama of Goethe and Schiller, the re-evaluation of life in Gerhart Hauptmann's dramas and in the work of Schnitzler—wrongly considered as indifferent to values—sufficiently illustrate this point.

The complicated nature of Heidegger's thought and the import of his analysis of existence could only be indicated on these pages. It was not my intention to offer new aspects for the interpretation of works of art, but to establish existing modern methods upon a uniform philosophical basis, viz. the interpretation of existence as temporality, i. e., a structure of life in which every instant is determined essentially and integrally by the past and the future, by *Geworfenheit* and *Vorlaufen zum Tode*.

NOTE ON CHATEAUBRIAND'S *ATALA*

The publication of *Atala* in 1801 and its successive editions gave rise to innumerable appreciations of a favorable and of an adverse nature, many of which found their way into print.¹ These were not confined to France alone nor to the Continent. Three translations in English of the work, one of which appeared in Boston,² as well as editions in the original, made it possible for Americans to become acquainted with it. In view of the violent controversy then being waged abroad over the merits of Chateaubriand's narrative, it was to be expected that a critical appraisal of its contents in some form would eventually appear on this side of the Atlantic. But if *Atala* aroused any considerable discussion on the part of American readers, we have so far no record of it, with the exception of an anonymous article in the *American Quarterly Review* for December, 1827,³ wherein the author questions the authenticity of some of the descriptions made of the Mississippi country by the French writer. To all appearances, this is the only early criticism of Chateaubriand's tale from an American pen that has come down to us.

There was, however, in America, another public which the Vicomte's book was bound to interest, because of its nature and because of the author's reputation. I refer to the French expatriates who had sought peace and refuge in the United States. It is not unreasonable to assume that the story of his heroine excited much more critical comment in this milieu, but here again the paucity of documents makes it difficult to determine the nature and extent of the criticism engendered. Our earliest evidence of its existence, hitherto, was to be found in two letters communicated from America to a Continental periodical⁴ in 1832 and 1835, by René de Mersenne, a French exile, who also voices doubts of Chateaubriand's claims as a traveler and a descriptive artist. But there is an earlier

¹ Cf. R. Kerviler, *Répertoire général de bio-bibliographie bretonne*, Rennes, 1894, VIII, 417 ff.

² Cf. G. Chinard, *Œuvres de Chateaubriand: Atala*, René, Paris, 1930. Introd., p. xxviii.

³ II, 458-482. Cited by J. Bédier, *Études Critiques*, Paris, 1903, p. 127 ff.

⁴ *L'Invariable, nouveau mémorial catholique*, Fribourg en Suisse, II (1832), 302-324 and VII (1835), 76-112, cited by Bédier, pp. 131-132.

letter, somewhat hostile in character, addressed to Simon Chaudron, the Editor of *L'Abeille Américaine*,⁵ one of the first newspapers to be printed in French in the United States. As the first part of it appeared in the issue of March 16, 1816,⁶ it antedates Mersenne's letters by several years.

Although it does not materially modify the published conclusions of Professors Chinard, Bédier, and others, concerning the question, it deserves reproduction here, because of its priority and also because it expresses the reaction of one, who, as an obscure contemporary and compatriot of Chateaubriand, was apparently unimpressed by the latter's description of a country he was supposed to have known at first hand.

Territoire du Missouri, Saint-Louis, le 10 Février 1816.

Monsieur.

Je vous prie de faire publier par votre Abeille qui, je n'en doute pas, voyage beaucoup, cette lettre, dont le but est de rectifier des idées fausses, données sur un pays encore peu particulièrement connu en Europe.

J'étais à Paris lorsqu'*Atala*, épisode du grand et pompeux ouvrage de M. J. A. Chateaubriand, intitulé *Génie du Christianisme* ou etc., fut imprimé et répandu dans le public. Cet ouvrage fit grand bruit et c'était tout naturel: du merveilleux qui semble venir de loin, il n'en faut pas davantage pour exalter l'imagination de beaucoup de lecteurs. Il y eut donc un grand nombre d'enthousiastes et un petit nombre de critiques, dont la voix fut étouffée par les éloges des premiers. J'étais fort jeune alors, et me souviens néanmoins de la renommée de M. Chateaubriand, laquelle n'a fait qu'augmenter jusqu'à ce jour, souvent en dépit du bon goût, du bon sens ou de la vérité.

Dans cet ouvrage, qu'il donne comme descriptif, et en même temps comme un fait presque historique, il abuse le lecteur de la même manière que lorsqu'il dit, dans un autre ouvrage, que les eaux de la Mer Morte portent les métaux les plus lourds. Son imagination entichée du merveilleux, le conduisant souvent loin du réel, lui fait annoncer des erreurs qui ne sont pas vraiment tolérables. Il dit avoir beaucoup voyagé et particulièrement dans la Louisiane; mais il faut que ce soit sous la protection et par la puissance de quelque génie, car il a vu bien des choses que les personnes qui visitent les mêmes lieux, n'ont pas la faculté d'apercevoir.

L'histoire d'*Atala* à la main, j'ai remonté le Mississipi, jusqu'à l'endroit où il reçoit les eaux de la Belle-rivière (l'Ohio), et même encore plus haut; et j'ai vu de mes propres yeux que la description donnée par M. Chateaubriand des deux rives de ce fleuve, n'a pas la moindre ressemblance avec

⁵ *L'Abeille Américaine, Journal Historique, Politique et Littéraire*, Philadelphia [July 9, 1815, to April 15, 1818].

⁶ Vol. II, No. xxiii.

la vérité. Il parle de monts, de montagnes, et d'arbres suspendus à des rochers sur la rive orientale; et le voyageur qui cherche ces objets, n'aperçoit, dans une étendue de près de cinq cents lieues, que les écores blanches audessus du village du Bâton rouge, la petite colline, nommée par les Français, Roche à Gavion (où il y a cependant peu de roches, s'il y en a), et au pied de laquelle est bâti le fort Adams; et ensuite quelques écores, un peu plus élevés sur ce côté, que sur la rive opposée. De ce nombre sont ceux des Natchez, ceux appelés les écores à Margot et celui de la Mine-de-fer, à sept lieues environ, au-dessous de l'embouchure de l'Ohio: dans tous les autres endroits sur la rive de l'est, le fleuve déborde presque tous les ans et inonde jusqu'à trois ou quatre lieues, au pied des côteaues, dont il a éloigné son cours, et dont en se rapprochant et en dégradant une partie, il a formé ces écores que je viens de nommer. Sur la rive de l'Ouest, il s'étend beaucoup plus loin, les terres de ce côté étant en effet plus basses.

Sur le bord Occidental, des savannes se déroulent à perte de vue; leurs flots de verdure, en s'éloignant, semblent monter dans l'azur du ciel où ils s'évanouissent, dit Mr. Chateaubriand; et cependant depuis la Balise jusqu'à l'embouchure du Missouri, il n'y en a point, et il n'y en a jamais existé une naturelle d'un mille carré. L'établissement de la petite prairie, à dix lieues au-dessous de la Nouvelle Madrid, n'est pas sur un terrain qui ait cette étendue il s'en faut de beaucoup. De sorte, qu'à l'exception des lieux habités, lorsqu'on remonte le Mississipi, on est continuellement entre deux haies d'arbres, de la plus ennuyeuse monotonie, lesquels sont difficilement pénétrables à l'homme, à cause des cannes, des lianes, des muriers de renard, des buissons et des ronces qui se croisent en tous sens.

Il faudrait des yeux d'une qualité particulière pour apercevoir, à travers ces bois inconcevablement touffus, (et non pas comme il dit, de *l'extrémité de ces avenues*,) les ours enivrés de raisins.⁷ Ces animaux en font peu de cas ayant une abondance indicible de glands de toutes espèces, de fênes et autres fruits farineux.

J'ai cherché le palmier *qui balance légèrement ses éventails de verdure auprès du Magnolia*: j'ai vu dans les forêts de la rive gauche, seulement, et dans l'intérieur de cette immense contrée le Magnolia⁸ ou Laurier Tulipe ou Tulipier, ainsi que l'appellent les Français et les Américains; mais j'ai perdu mes peines à chercher le Palmiste ou Palmier.

M. Chateaubriand ne peut pas avoir vu le jasmin des florides sur les bords du Mississipi; cette fleur n'y a jamais été indigène. Les Cariboux, les Orignals et les Carcajoux,⁹ sont des animaux particuliers aux régions froides du Canada; quant au serpent oiseleur, c'est un animal fabuleux,

⁷ Je laisse à décider aux chimistes si le jus non fermenté de ce fruit peut enivrer?

⁸ Il y en a en Amérique de quatre espèces; mais ce qu'il y a de singulier ici, c'est qu'il n'en existe [*sic*] pas sur la rive opposée, sinon quelques-uns qu'on y a transplantés.

⁹ Il y avait autrefois dans la Basse-Louisianne des Elans, on n'en trouve plus que dans la Haute.

dont il embellit ces retraites; et pour ce qu'il dit des contre-courans ce serait une chose curieuse, et qu'il annonce comme tant d'autres faussetés ou exagérations, en disant, qu'on voit sur les deux courans latéraux,¹⁰ remonter le long des rivages, des îles flottantes de Pistia et de Nénuphar &c. Les citronniers, les tamarins, les pistia, les bignonias, le smilax, les graines rouges d'azaléa, les grosses chauve-souris, sont encore autant de choses que sa brillante imagination a placées dans ces contrées, en dépit de la vérité; mais quand on a entendu le gémissement des arbres et les cris des fantômes, que ne peut on pas avoir vu?

Il fait dire à Atala: prends courage, le coeur de l'homme est comme l'éponge du fleuve &c.; dans quel endroit du Mississipi a-t-il trouvé des éponges? dans quel fleuve, dans quelle rivière a-t-il entendu dire qu'on en trouve?

The letter is continued in the following issue of the *Abeille* dated March 23, 1816, under the heading "*Suite des observations sur l'ouvrage de Mr. Chateaubriand.*"¹¹

Le nom de son héros principal est celui d'une nation, autrefois nom-breuse, qui l'est moins aujourd'hui, et occupe encore néanmoins une grande partie du pays compris entre le Mississipi et la rivière de la Mobile, dont le langage est dérivé de la langue Mobillienne, qui semble être la racine de celles de presque tous les peuples des Florides. Il doit paraître singulier, que M. Chateaubriand ait appelé un sauvage des Natchez, du nom d'une nation voisine. Au reste, après la lecture de cet ouvrage, tous ceux qui ont vu la Louisiane, conviennent, d'accord avec les créoles et les habitans, que l'auteur avait sans doute la berlue lorsqu'il a exploré ce pays, dont il donne une peinture si pompeusement fausse.

C'est pendant la révolution française que M. Chateaubriand a, dit-il, parcouru l'Amérique et visité les environs de la cataracte du Niagara, qu'il semble qu'il ait trouvé déserts, quoique depuis long-temps, ils soient très-habités. C'est-là qu'il a vu des Natchez, émigrans du pays des Chikachas, d'où ils étaient chassés par les blancs de la Virginie; cependant, déjà à cette époque, les derniers rejetons des Natchez étaient confondus avec les autres nations des Florides. Jamais les Américains n'ont dépouillé les Natchez, ni les Chikachas de leurs terres; il y a anachronisme et erreur.

Je ne dirai rien des oraisons funèbres, des chansons et surtout des idées poétiques et tout-à-fait dans le goût *sauvage européen*, que M. Chateaubriand prête à ses héros. Je ne troublerai pas non plus la colombe, qui vient de temps en temps arracher un cheveu de l'enfant pour se faire un nid, tandis qu'il y a, dans ces lieux-là, des mousses, des plumes et du poil d'animaux de tous côtés. Je ne critiquerai pas non plus les *aigles entraînés*

¹⁰ Tout le monde connaît les effets du courant et sait ce que c'est que les contre-courans et les remous.

¹¹ Cf. II (No. xxiv), 374-376.

par le courant d'air, descendant en tournoyant & le Carcajou¹² suspendu par sa longue queue, au bout d'une branche brisée, pour saisir dans l'abîme les cadavres brisés des élans & des ours; mais je ne puis m'empêcher de demander si Mr. Chateaubriand parle sérieusement lorsqu'il dit: *Quand la nuit, au clair de la lune, vous apercevez, sur la nudité d'une savane, une Yeuse isolée revêtue de cette draperie blanche* (de la mousse. Il veut dire la barbe espagnole, sans doute.) *vous croiriez voir un fantôme, trainant après lui ses longs voiles:* et lorsqu'il parle, dans un autre endroit, de *rochers taillés en forme de fantômes*, il semble que Mr. Chateaubriand ait plutôt voulu faire un conte de grand-mère, pour les petits enfans et les niais, qu'un ouvrage sensé pour des hommes raisonnables.

On pourrait trouver, je crois, bien des choses à relever dans cet ouvrage, où l'auteur s'est, dit-il, efforcé de ramener la littérature à ce goût antique trop long temps oublié de nos jours. Je n'en ferai cependant remarquer qu'un passage ainsi conçu: *Ces nues ployant et déployant leurs voiles, se déroulaient en zones diaphanes de satin blanc; se dispersaient en légers flocons d'écumes, ou formaient dans les cieux des bancs d'une ouate éblouissante, si doux à l'oeil, qu'on croyait ressentir leur molesse et leur élasticité.*—*Des nues ployant et déployant leurs voiles;* quel pathos! on croirait qu'il parle d'un navire; *se déroulaient en zones diaphanes, &c.,* quelle ridicule redondance! *des bancs d'une ouate éblouissante, si doux à l'oeil.* . . . il faudrait *si douce*, en accordant l'adjectif avec *ouate* et non pas avec *bancs*: cet accord est dur; il faut s'arrêter et réfléchir, avant de l'apercevoir: *qu'on croyait ressentir leur molesse et leur élasticité:* il faudrait dire: *qu'on croyait en ressentir la molesse et l'élasticité.*¹³ Des phrases empoulées, des idées outrées et incompréhensibles, un mépris de la vérité et une supersition qui se décèle; est-ce là ce que Mr. Chateaubriand appelle de la belle littérature?

Il dit, dans sa préface, en parlant de Voltaire: *qu'on n'est pas grand écrivain, parce qu'on met l'ame à la torture.* On pourrait lui demander si on l'est, pour y mettre l'esprit et la raison, en faisant sortir des forêts des voix de fantômes.

Depuis long-temps, dit-il encore, *ie ne lis plus qu'Homère et la Bible; Heureux si l'on s'en aperçoit.* Quel rapport y a-t-il entre Homère et la Bible? Quel rapport y a-t-il entre le livre des fictions et le livre de la vérité PURE? Quoiqu'il en soit, comme nous ne sommes plus au temps des merveilles et des miracles; en cherchant à faire accroire qu'il s'en opère dans les forêts du Nouveau Monde, c'est s'écarter de ces deux grands et éternels modèles du beau et du vrai. La vérité, lorsqu'elle est belle, n'a pas besoin de clinquant, et dans son langage simple et élevé, elle n'a pas recours pour plaire aux rêveries, aux extravagances des contes. La naïveté et les couleurs naturelles doivent seules briller dans un tableau, et je suis

¹² Mr. de Chateaubriand, à ce qu'il paraît, ne connaît pas bien le Carcajou ou Quincajou, qui est une espèce de Hyène ou de Loup-cervier, qui n'a point la faculté de se suspendre par la queue.

¹³ Règle de grammaire: pronoms possessifs applicables aux choses.

parfaitement de son avis, on ne doit point s'occuper de l'imitation des monstres.

Il est peut-être bien hardi d'attaquer la renommée de M. Chateaubriand; mais lorsqu'il attaque Voltaire, Rousseau et d'autres gens, qui sont autant au dessus de lui par leur mérite, que je lui suis inférieur; lorsqu'il attaque les philosophes et les écrivains modernes; lorsqu'il écrit tant de choses insupportables, je ne vois pas pourquoi il serait épargné.

Je finis cette lettre, en priant mes lecteurs de comparer ses descriptions avec celles de M. M. l'abbé Barthelemi, l'abbé Raynal, Bernardin-de-Saint-Pierre, Marmontel, Buffon, et autres écrivains, alors ils jugeront si j'ai raison ou non, de dire qu'il s'est écarté du vrai beau, pour s'abandonner aux écarts ridicules d'une imagination extravagante.

Je suis, &c.

Signé, LOGUY.

BERNARD A. FACTEAU

Catholic University of America

NOTES ON LOVENJOUL'S HISTOIRE DES ŒUVRES DE H. DE BALZAC

In comparing various editions of the works of Balzac I have noted a few apparent inaccuracies, omissions, and misleading statements in that *vade mecum* of all students of the great novelist, the *Histoire des Œuvres de H. de Balzac* by the Vicomte de Spoelberch de Lovenjoul. It may be of service to users of that indispensable book to point them out.

P. 25. Lovenjoul does not mention a reprint of tome IV of *Scènes de la Vie privée* issued by Werdet in 1837 that really makes a fourth edition of *Même Histoire*. The title-page is as follows: SCÈNES / DE / LA VIE PRIVÉE, / PAR / M. DE BALZAC. / quatrième volume. / PARIS. / WERDET, ÉDITEUR, / RUE DE SEINE, N. 49. / — / 1837. This edition is referred to in the *Lettres à l'Étrangère*, I, 295, under the date of January 18, 1836.

Nous réimprimons en ce moment le quatrième volume des *Scènes de la Vie privée*, où j'ai fait de grands changements par rapport au sens général de *Même Histoire*. Ainsi la fuite d'Hélène avec le meurtrier est rendue presque vraisemblable; il a fallu longtemps pour trouver ces derniers nœuds.

The change to which he particularly refers is the interpolation of the passage beginning with the words: "Hélène était arrivée à un âge . . ." and ending a half-page below with the words: "Hélène

ne souhaitait plus aller au bal." (Balzac, *Œuvres*, édition définitive, III, 641.)

P. 31. Lovenjoul notes that *Autre Étude de femme* contains the beginning of *La Femme comme il faut*.¹ On page 43 he prints the end of *La Femme comme il faut*, "qui n'a pas été conservée dans *Autre Étude de femme*." But, with the exception of the first nine lines ending with the words: "le niveau de ses articles," all that Lovenjoul prints may be found, with few changes, in *Autre Étude de femme*. (Balzac, *Œuvres*, IV, 541-545.)

P. 67. In describing the various editions of *Le Lys dans la vallée* Lovenjoul says: "L'envoi était daté d'abord du 8 août 1827, date qui a disparu depuis et qui précisait l'époque où se passe l'histoire." It is difficult to see how one can arrive at 1827 as the date of the action of this story. Balzac gives, as was his custom, many precise dates in the course of the narrative, and these lead inescapably to 1820 as the year of the death of Madame de Mortsauf, or at the very latest to 1823.² The envoi is really more closely connected in time with *Le Contrat de mariage* than with *Le Lys dans la vallée*. We must allow at least a brief interval to elapse after the death of Madame de Mortsauf before the beginning of the liaison between Félix de Vandenesse and Natalie de Manerville which figures in the *dénouement* of *Le Contrat de mariage*.

P. 97. Lovenjoul's statement that the "partie judiciaire," added to *Le Cabinet des Antiques* between its first printing in 1838 in *Le Constitutionnel* and its publication in two volumes by Souverain in the following year, "va de la page 94 . . . jusqu'à la

¹ Lovenjoul does not mention an edition of *La Femme comme il faut* published by Gabriel Roux and Cassanet in 1847 or 1848. Such an edition was at least announced on the second cover-page of *Le Provincial à Paris*, 2 vols., Gabriel Roux et Cassanet, Paris, 1847. Lovenjoul gives the date of this edition of *Le Provincial à Paris* as 1848, but the title-page of the copy of the library of the University of Michigan has 1847.

² Cerfberr and Christophe (*Répertoire de la Comédie humaine*, Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1893), in the notice devoted to Madame de Mortsauf, give 1820 as the year of her death. In the biography of Madame de Listomère, however, they give it as "vers 1828." They are apparently misled by *Étude de femme*, the action of which, at least as it was originally conceived, can not be earlier than 1829. The allusion in that story to the death of Madame de Mortsauf is one of the innumerable inconsistencies in the chronology of the *Comédie humaine*.

page 125" is likely to give a somewhat wrong impression. While the long addition of more than thirty pages in which the legal battle is developed begins at p. 94, the introduction of this development had involved considerable changes and additions before this point. They really begin on p. 83 with the words: "Il resta, malgré la douleur que lui causait ce spectacle." The following five pages, as far as the words: "Ouvrez de par le roi!" on p. 88, have been added, except a line or two here and there. The Blandereaus, the Blondets with the exception of Émile, the Camusots and Sauvager all come into the story by the way of the "partie judiciaire" and were absent from the original version.³

P. 102. Concerning *Un Grand Homme de province à Paris* Lovenjoul writes:

Deux de ces chapitres: *Comment se font les petits journaux* et *le Souper* avaient paru avant la mise en vente de l'ouvrage, dans *l'Estafette* du 8 juin 1839. Il s'y trouvait alors un portrait du poète Canalis tout autre que celui qui commence aujourd'hui ligne 22, page 285.

But this portrait does not come in that part of the story comprised in these two chapters, as Lovenjoul seems to say. It is not even to be found at all in *Un Grand Homme de province à Paris* as published in 1839. It is clear from Lovenjoul's statement on p. 105 that this second part of *Illusions perdues* began in that edition with Lucien's letter to his sister on p. 299 of the *édition définitive* and that consequently this portrait appeared originally in the first part, published in 1837 as tome IV of the first edition of *Scènes de la Vie de province*. The original text of the portrait offers several variations from that reproduced by Lovenjoul. It is as follows:

³ The Belgian contrefaçon published by Méline, Cans et Cie. has the title, *Les Rivalités en province*, under which the story appeared in *Le Constitutionnel*, and follows the feuilleton also in omitting the opening description of the d'Esgrignon family which had appeared separately in the *Chronique de Paris* of March 8, 1836. The title-page is dated 1838. It can not have been issued, however, till the following year. The text was apparently taken at first from *Le Constitutionnel*, for it does not contain the additions beginning at p. 83, but does contain all the additions indicated by Lovenjoul. It would seem that the Paris edition reached the publishers while the copy was being set up and that they, aware of the changed *dénouement*, substituted the text of the book for that of the feuilleton.

Le quatrième était un des plus illustres poètes de cette époque, un jeune homme qui n'en était alors qu'à l'aube de sa gloire, et qui partant n'avait ni façons byroniennes, ni prétensions impériales, ni plénitude de lui-même. Il se contentait d'être un gentilhomme aimable et spirituel, il en était à se faire pardonner son génie; mais on devinait dans ses formes sèches, dans sa réserve, une immense ambition qui devait plus tard étouffer la poésie; il avait une beauté froide et compassée, mais pleine de dignité; c'était Canning maigre et réduit à ses vers.

What is the source of the text given by Lovenjoul? The only other edition of *Illusions perdues* cited by him, previous to that of the *Comédie humaine*, is that of Charpentier, 1839. The presence of the name Canalis makes me hesitate to accept the conjecture that Lovenjoul's text is taken from that edition. *Un Grand Homme de province à Paris*, published in June, 1839, did not contain the name, though it was introduced twice in the next edition of that work, that of the *Comédie humaine*. Neither does the name occur in *Mémoires de Deux Jeunes Mariées* in 1841, though the place that Canalis was later to occupy there was already prepared for him.

P. 130. Lovenjoul gives the original ending, but not the original beginning of *Un Prince de la Bohême*. That as well as the ending was different from the version of the *Comédie humaine*, and naturally did not contain the names and allusions that presuppose *La Muse du département* (1843) and *Un Adultère rétrospectif* (1844).

P. 132. Lovenjoul does not notice that the date, "juillet 1836," given to *Les Employés* in the *édition définitive*, seems to be a misprint for "juillet 1838," the date which appears in the first edition of the *Comédie humaine*. If not a misprint, it was certainly an error. The first mention of *Les Employés* is in December, 1836.⁴

P. 181 (and p. 138). Lovenjoul does not mention an edition of a volume of *Scènes de la Vie parisienne* containing *Les Marana* and *Ferragus*, 1 vol. in-8, 1838, issuing, according to the title-page, from the "*Bureaux du Figaro*." A volume of this edition is listed in the catalog of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

P. 178. In saying that *Le Chef-d'œuvre inconnu* "entra en 1845, dédié, et le titre de son premier chapitre changé en celui de

⁴ Cf. *Lettres à l'Étrangère*, I, 367. Miss Mary W. Scott has already pointed out that Lovenjoul is in error in saying that the additions to *La Femme supérieure* found in *Les Employés* were added in the edition in two volumes published by Werdet in 1838. Cf. *MP.*, XXIII, 315.

Gillette, dans le tome I de la cinquième édition des *Études philosophiques*." Lovenjoul implies that this chapter had not previously been so entitled. But in the Belgian contrefaçon of 1837, based apparently on the fourth edition of the *Études philosophiques*, the first chapter is already entitled *Gillette*. In the contrefaçon, however, the tale was not dated, though Lovenjoul says that the date was added in the fourth edition.

P. 178. *Melmoth réconcilié* did not appear in tome V of the fourth edition of *Études philosophiques* but in tome XIV (originally numbered XXII), as is stated on page 164.

P. 193. Lovenjoul does not record the second edition of *Le Livre mystique*, published in 1836. According to the *Lettres à l'Étrangère* (I, 293 and 300) it differed in important respects from the first:

Je désirerais que vous eussiez la deuxième édition du *Livre mystique*, où j'ai fait quelques changements, mais tout n'est pas fini en fait de correction. . . . Il est bien changé, *Louis Lambert*; le voilà complet. Les dernières pensées se raccordent avec *Séraphita*; tout est coordonné. Puis, la lacune entre le collège et Blois est remplie; vous verrez cela.

A. G. CANFIELD

University of Michigan

UNE SOURCE DU "DÉCOR" DE RACINE

Dans sa belle étude *De l'Action dans la tragédie de Racine*,¹ M. G. Le Bidois a consacré un chapitre au rôle du visage dans le drame de Racine. Il affirme que les prédécesseurs de Racine n'avaient guère connu la ressource des notations du visage. Selon lui la figure concourait seulement, et pour une faible part, au spectacle du drame grec. Il donne de l'apparente négligence des dramaturges grecs plusieurs raisons. "Assujetti aux conditions d'une vaste scène, obligé d'offrir une image distincte aux regards d'une foule énorme et reculée, plus attentif . . . à la beauté qu'à l'expression,"² le théâtre grec n'aurait pas soupçonné que la figure fût un puissant instrument dramatique. Au surplus, on eût été bien empêché de s'en servir, car le masque qui recouvrait la figure

¹ Paris, Poussielgue, 1900, ch. IV.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

"ne la rehaussait qu'en la fixant dans l'immobilité."³ Le visage de l'acteur grec, immuable et distant, n'aurait donc guère contribué à révéler les sentiments ou les dispositions du personnage.

Tout ce raisonnement me semble reposer sur une méprise et un oubli. Il importe peu que les Athéniens aient pu ou non distinguer les traits de leurs acteurs, ou que le masque ne permit point de jeux de physionomie. Les spectateurs de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne n'observaient certes pas par eux-mêmes toutes les altérations de physionomie qui annoncent les péripéties des tragédies de Racine. Se serait-on aperçu, sans le secours du texte, qu'à tel instant tel personnage "changeait de visage"? L'altération est-elle praticable? Ne suffit-il pas d'ailleurs qu'un témoin la signale à l'auditoire? N'est-ce pas, pour ne citer qu'un exemple, la remarque de Monime qui fait passer la rampe au "changement de visage" de Mithridate?⁴ C'est dire que si les Grecs avaient eu l'idée d'interpréter par la parole la physionomie des personnages, ni le masque ni l'éloignement de l'acteur ne les auraient empêchés de le faire . . . bien au contraire. De fait, on relève chez Sophocle et Euripide bon nombre de cas où le dialogue souligne une expression de visage pour l'associer au spectacle ou à l'intrigue. Sophocle crée une atmosphère de malheur par la description d'un personnage:

Voyez-vous cette femme . . . ? elle s'avance vers nous l'air éploré, toute éperdue.⁵

Je vois la tendre Ismène alarmée pour sa sœur . . . un nuage de douleurs répandu sur ses yeux altère son visage . . . les larmes coulent sur ses joues délicates.⁶

Il note le trait qui, à un moment, donne le ton à une physionomie, quand ce ne serait que le pli d'une lèvre. A sa bouche "silencieuse et cruelle" Polynice a vu la sourde animosité d'Edipe.⁷

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Mithridate*, III, 5. Le "changement" est si peu évident que Monime elle-même n'est pas sûre de ce qu'elle a vu; cf. IV, 1. A plus forte raison, il est douteux que les spectateurs puissent voir qu'un personnage a changé de couleur; cf. *Athalie*, V, 4.

⁵ *Les Trachiniennes*, V, 1. En ce qui concerne Sophocle les références se rapportent au *Théâtre de Sophocle*, Paris, Flammarion, 1926. Cf. *Edipe à Colone*, I, 5.

⁶ *Antigone*, II, 2.

⁷ *Edipe à Colone*, IV, 4.

Grâce aux indications que fournit un personnage, le spectateur peut suivre la marche du mal de Philoctète :

... pourquoi cette stupeur? ... Pourquoi lever ainsi les yeux? ... Le sommeil avant peu va s'emparer de lui ... il a les yeux fermés à la lumière. ... Faites silence ... il semble ouvrir les yeux.⁸

Au moment où ils vont entrer chez Clytemnestre pour l'assassiner, Oreste demande à sa sœur si elle saura se composer un visage :

... dites-moi ... comment ... vous pourrez empêcher que la gaieté peinte sur votre visage ne vous trahisse ... ?⁹

Le regard dit souvent plus que les lèvres. Dans les yeux des Athéniens Cléonte déchiffre l'attitude qu'ils vont prendre :

... je vois dans vos regards que mon arrivée ici vous fait éprouver quelque effroi.¹⁰

Philoctète a lu dans les yeux de Néoptolème une irrévocable décision :

Au nom des dieux de la patrie, ne me dépouille point de mes armes. ... Malheureux que je suis ! Il ne me répond plus. ... Il m'annonce par ses regards qu'il ne me les rendra pas. ...¹¹

Avec la même complaisance que Sophocle, Euripide dépeint l'aspect de personnages¹² et note les variations de physionomie.¹³ Il fait du visage un moyen d'action. Lorsque, par respect pour les lois de l'hospitalité, Admète cache à Hercule la mort d'Alceste, le visage d'un serviteur trahit le secret de son maître et change le cours de l'action :

Eh ! l'homme ! (dit Hercule) Pourquoi ce regard sombre et inquiet ? ... en voyant ici un ami de ton maître, tu l'accueilles avec un visage triste, les sourcils froncés, et tu parais préoccupé de quelque malheur étranger.¹⁴

⁸ *Philoctète*, III, 1, 2.

⁹ *Électre*, IV, 1.

¹⁰ *Œdipe à Colone*, III, 2.

¹¹ *Philoctète*, IV, 2.

¹² En ce qui regarde Euripide, les références se rapportent au *Théâtre d'Euripide*, Paris, Garnier, s. d. vol. I. Cf. *Hippolyte*, 236-240 ; *les Supplantes*, 377 et 378.

¹³ Cf. *Médée*, 210 ; *Alceste*, 296.

¹⁴ *Alceste*, 309.

Alarmé, Hercule interroge. Instruit du malheur de son ami, il entreprend de ramener Alceste de chez les morts.

Il y a dans *Iphigénie à Aulis* des "scènes de regards." Agamemnon ne parvient pas à se maîtriser, et Iphigénie soupçonne un malheur secret:

Éclaircis donc ton front et que la joie brille dans tes yeux.¹⁵

Agamemnon, à son tour, découvre dans les yeux d'Iphigénie, de Clytemnestre et du Chœur l'angoisse qui les tourmente. Il se sent environné de regards scrutateurs:

Ma fille. . . . Pourquoi ton regard n'est-il plus joyeux. . . . Qu'y a-t-il donc? Comme vous vous accordez tous à me montrer un visage éperdu, des regards troublés! ¹⁶

La querelle d'Agamemnon et de Ménélas débute par un duel de regards:

Regarde-moi, voilà par où je veux commencer.

—Crois-tu que je tremble et que je ne lèverai pas les yeux . . . ? ¹⁷

La tragédie latine (M. Le Bidois n'en a rien dit) a continué l'emploi de la "physionomie parlée."¹⁸ Sénèque interprète les traits de personnages entrant en scène,¹⁹ interroge l'aspect de gens qui voudraient taire leurs préoccupations,²⁰ note les changements d'expression.²¹ Il ajoute un développement: il engage le spectateur à surveiller les traits d'un personnage qui doit éprouver une horrible secousse. C'est sur le visage de Thyeste qu'Atrée se promet d'étudier l'effet de sa vengeance:

Je me fais une joie d'observer le visage du perfide, quand il verra les têtes de ses fils . . . de le voir muet et sans haleine, dans le saisissement

¹⁵ *Iphigénie à Aulis*, 440.

¹⁶ *Id.*, 457.

¹⁷ *Id.*, 429.

¹⁸ La comédie latine a fait usage des notations du visage (cf. Plaute, *le Marchand*, II, 3; III, 4; Térence, *l'Eunuque*, II, 4); mais il ne paraît pas qu'elle ait ajouté à la tradition établie. Sur l'usage du masque dans la comédie latine, cf. Schanz-Hosius, *Römische Literatur-Geschichte*, I Teil, 148-149.

¹⁹ Les références qui suivent se rapportent au *Théâtre Complet des Latins*, Paris, Didot, 1862. Cf. *Hercule furieux*, I et II; *Octavie*, II; *Agamemnon*, V.

²⁰ Cf. *Agamemnon*, II; *Octavie*, IV; *Hercule sur l'Œta*, II.

²¹ Cf. *Agamemnon*, III; *Hercule furieux*, IV.

du désespoir. Ce n'est pas quand il sera malheureux, mais à l'instant où il le deviendra, que je veux le voir.²²

Les citations qui précèdent montrent assez que la tragédie grecque et, à sa suite, la tragédie latine ont su faire de la figure humaine—en ses aspects soutenus et en ses expressions passagères—un décor et un moyen d'action. Il serait étrange que Racine, qui avait tant pratiqué les Anciens, ne leur eût pas emprunté une invention qu'ils avaient eux-mêmes si largement utilisée.²³

MAURICE BAUDIN

New York University

JEAN BODEL AND ROMAIN ROLLAND

A striking example of the reproduction by authors in the late nineteenth century of medieval form and subject-matter is furnished by Romain Rolland's little piece, *Saint Louis*, first published in 1896, and later united with two other dramatic works to form a volume entitled *les Tragédies de la Foi*. In Act IV, as the crusaders of the saintly king's forces are about to join in battle with the Saracens, they begin a war-chant, which is borrowed, almost copied outright, from the song of the Christians and of the angel in Jean Bodel's *Jeu de Saint Nicolas*, of the thirteenth century. A glance shows the practical identity of the two selections. In the mediaeval work, the Christians first say:

Sains sepulcres, aïe! Segneur, or du bien faire!
Sarrasin et païen viennent pour nous fourfaire,
Vés les armes reluire: tous li cuers m'en esclaire.¹

Rolland has the people chant:

Saint Sepulere, à l'aide! Sarrasins et païens viennent pour nous fourfaire. Voyez les armes luire; tout mon coeur en tressaille²

In Bodel, a single Christian then continues:

²² *Thyeste*, v.

²³ Certains rapprochements s'imposent: cp. Racine, *Iphigénie*, II, 2; IV, 4 et Euripide, *Iphigénie à Aulis*, éd. cit., 440 et 457.

¹ *Jeu de Saint Nicolas*, ed. Alfred Jeanroy, *Classiques français du Moyen-Age*, Champion, Paris, 1925, p. 18-20.

² *Les Tragédies de la Foi*, Paris, Ollendorf, 1913, pp. 88, 89.

Segneur, n'en doutés ja, vés chi nostre juïse:
 Bien sai tout i morrons el Damedieu servise.
 Mais mout bien m'i vendrai, se m'espée ne brise.
 Ja n'en garira un ne coiffe ne haubers.
 Segnieur, el Dieu serviche soit hui chascuns offers!
 Paradys sera nostres et eus sera ynfers.

While Rolland's band of Christians sing together:

Amis, n'en doutez pas, voici notre jugement. Bien le sais: y mourrons
 pour la gloire de Dieu. Mais bien cher me vendrai, si mon fer ne se brise.
 Nul n'en garantira ni coiffe ni haubert. Paradis sera nôtre, à eux sera
 enfer.

Next, an angel appears, in Bodel's play, crying:

Segneur, soiés tout asseür,
 N'aiés doutanche ne peür,
 Messagiers sui Nostre Segneur,
 Qui vous metra fors de douleur—
 Metés hardiement vos cors
 Pour Dieu, car chou est chi li mors
 Dont tout li pules morir doit
 Qui Dieu aime de cuer et croit.

A girl among the crusaders, named Bérengère, sings, in *Saint Louis*:

Amis, soyez tous assurés; n'ayez plus doute ni frayeur. Messenger suis du
 bon Seigneur, qui vous mettra hors de douleur. Ne craignez d'exposer
 votre corps aux blessures. Oh! que la mort est douce pour ceux qui
 aiment Dieu!

In *Saint Nicolas*, a Christian asks:

Qui estés vous, biaux sire, qui si nous confortés
 Et si haute parole de Dieu nous aportés?

And the answer is:

Angeles sui a Dieu, biaux amis;
 Pour vo confort m'a chi tramis.
 Soiés seür, car ens es chieux
 Vous a Diex fait sieges esliex;
 Alés, bien avés commechié;
 Pour Dieu seres tout detrenchié,
 Mais le haute couronne arés.
 Je m'en vois; a Dieu demourés.

In Rolland, the people sing:

Qui êtes-vous, beau Sire, qui doucement parlez, et si haut réconfort de
 Dieu nous apportez?

And Bérengère chants the answer:

Ange suis du Seigneur, beaux amis; pour votre appui m'a envoyé. Soyez paisibles; dans les cieux Dieu vous regarde et vous attend. Allez, bien avez commencé; pour Dieu serez tous massacrés; mais la haute couronne du paradis aurez. Je m'en vais; hosannah! à Dieu donc, demeurez.

Interesting as this close parallelism between the two texts is, the chief teaching, however, lies elsewhere. It arises from the different manner in which the song in question is fitted into the general body of its drama. In the modern work there is close integration, the war-chant being a natural prolog to a battle which is both inevitable and of great importance for the development of the plot. On the other hand, both song and battle in Bodel's play are redundancies, introduced for the sole purpose of furnishing a single survivor from among the Christian forces, around whom the drama will thereafter revolve. The inability to distinguish between essential and non-essential elements is not peculiar to *le Jeu de Saint Nicolas*, but blights all mediaeval stage productions. Repeatedly, in the *Miracles de la Vierge* and similar works, the anonymous author diverts dialog from the serious problems of his drama to strictly routine elements, or represents what might quite as well have been taken for granted. Apparently, pre-Renaissance dramatists either were unable to rise from the *explicit* into the *implicit*, or the mental limitations of their audiences made it inadvisable to do so. Bodel's personal interest in the military operations of the crusaders furnishes a possible second reason for his introduction of this unnecessary episode into the *Saint Nicolas*.

GILBERT M. FESS

University of Missouri

NEW DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE CONCERNING CHAUCER'S MISSION TO LOMBARDY

It has long been known through the Foreign Accounts, published in *Life-Records*, that Geoffrey Chaucer departed from London May 28, 1378, on his second Italian journey, being "sent in the retinue" of Sir Edward de Berkeley to the parts of Lombardy "as well to the Lord of Milan (Bernabo Visconti), as to (Sir) John Hawkwood, for certain affairs touching the expedition of the King's

war."¹ The French Roll, in the same publication,² adds that Chaucer received on May 10, 1378, the letters of protection for his voyage abroad. More recently, Professor Manly has discovered a document which states that Chaucer, in making preparation for his absence from England, appointed Richard Baret on May 16 as his lieutenant at the office of Controller.³ Still another entry in *Life-Records*, also from the French Roll, relates that on May 21, a few days later, Chaucer gave power of attorney to John Gower and Richard Forester, "during his absence."⁴

In addition to these published records, there is a writ in the Exchequer Accounts,⁵ not hitherto printed, which supplies further information as to the number of persons in the commission and the route they followed in travelling to Italy. Although Chaucer's name is not mentioned, this document deals with his Italian journey. The dates are the same (i. e., May 28 to September 19); furthermore, we know that Chaucer was sent in Sir Edward de Berkeley's retinue. The present document relates also to Sir Edward's trip to Flanders in 1379, but for our purpose only the portions referring to the Lombardy mission need to be quoted.

Particule compotis Edwardi de Berkele militis euntis in quodam viagio per ipsum facto in seruicio Regis versus partes Lumbardie anno primo Regis Ricardi Neenon particule compoti eiusdem Edwardi de quodam alio viagio per ipsum facto in dicto seruicio Regis versus villam de Bruges in Flandria anno secundo. Berkele.

Membrane 1. xxviii die Maii anno primo Pasche.

Edwardo de Berkele militi misso in Nuncio Regis versus partes Lum-

¹ R. E. G. Kirk, *Life-Records of Chaucer*, Part IV (*Chaucer Society, Publications*, 1900), No. 122, pp. 218-19. See also "Forewords," p. xxix.

² No. 118, pp. 215-16.

³ J. M. Manly, "Chaucer as Controller," *Modern Philology*, xxv (1928), p. 123.

⁴ No. 120, p. 216.

⁵ Q. R. E 101/318/7. This writ is in a white leather pouch in the Public Record Office. Miss Edith Scroggs, of London, kindly sent me a transcript of the writ.

The following account of this document has been printed by Mirot and Déprez, "Les Ambassades Anglaises," *Bibl. de L'École des Chartes*, LX (1899), No. CDIX, p. 199. "1378, 28 mai-19 septembre.—Compte de Édouard de Berkeleye, chevalier, envoyé en Lombardie « tam ad dominum de Milan quam ad Johannem de Hawkwode, pro certis negociis expeditionem guerre tangentibus ». Depart: Londres. Dépenses, 121 livres 14 sous 4 deniers. Gages 20 sous par jour."

bardie tam ad dominum de Melan quam ad Johannem de Hawkwode pro certis negociis expedicionem guerre tangentibus in denariis per ipsum receptis de Willelmo Walworth & Johanne Phelipot Receptoribus denariorum pro guerris Regis super vadis suis ~~cxviii~~ li. vi s.

Membrane 4.

Particule compoti Edwardi de Berkeleye militis de Receptis vadiis & custibus suis eundo in quodam viagio per ipsum facto in seruicio Regis versus partes Lumbardie anno primo Regis.

Idem onerat se de cxxxiii li. vi s. viii d. receptis de Thesaurario & Camerario ad Receptam Scaccarii per manus Willelmi de Walworth & Johannis Philipote rectorum denariorum pro guerra Regis super vadiis suis missos versus dictas partes Lumbardie tam ad dominum de Melan quam ad Johannem de Hawkewode pro certis negociis expedicionem guerre tangentibus xxviii^o die Maii predicto anno primo termino Pasche. Summa Recepte cxxxiii li. vi s. viii d.

Idem computat in vadiis suis euntis in seruicio Regis in viagio predicto ad partes predictas Lumbardie ex ordinacione predicti consilii ipsius Regis ob causam supradictam videlicet a xxviii die Maii predicto anno primo quo die recessit de Civitate Londonie super dicto viagio versus partes supradictas usque xix^m diem Septembris proxime sequentem quo die reuenit ad eandem civitatem scilicet per cxv dies utroque die computato capientis per diem xx s. cxv li.

Summa vadiorum cxv li.

Et in passagio & repassagio maris ipsius Edwardi X hominum & X equorum suorum cum hernesiiis suis videlicet inter Douerram in Anglia & Caleysiam Francie infra idem tempus x marce.

Summa totalis vadiorum

& expensarum cxxi li. xiii s. iiii d.

Et debet xi li. xiii s.

iiii d.

This newly printed record, it is to be observed, makes it certain that the expedition travelled *via* Calais and thence overland to Italy. This appears from the fact that the commissioners were provided with horses for the trip from Calais. The document printed in *Life-Records*, on the other hand, mentions merely "le passage du dit Geffrey, et son repassage de la meer."⁶ Chaucerians have not known whether the entire journey was made by sea or

⁶ "Additions," No. 8, pp. 338-39. Professor Tatlock states (*JEGPh* xii [1913] 121) that the duration of Chaucer's second visit to Italy would have allowed him time to become familiar not only with the language but also with the country, "which many travelers find stimulates an interest in its literature." Added interest accrues to this suggestion in the light of our new evidence that Chaucer's journey from Calais to Lombardy was made overland.

not. The present record also states that ten persons, and not Chaucer alone, figured in Sir Edward's company. This circumstance, while it tends to increase the official dignity of the embassy, corrects the impression, received from *Life-Records*, that the undertaking was entrusted to Sir Edward and Chaucer alone. Who these other persons were, I have been unable to discover. Further search in the Public Record Office might bring to light records of some of the other commissioners.

The same entry in *Life-Records* (from the Issue Roll) which recounts that on May 28 Chaucer and Sir Edward were advanced wages for their Italian mission relates also that at this same date the army of John of Gaunt was paid some £4000 for service in the wars.⁷ It is possible, therefore, that the nine other members of the embassy sent to Lombardy were recruited from the personnel of Gaunt's forces. At least, it is interesting to observe that Sir Guischart d'Angle is mentioned in the document as a knight in John of Gaunt's service.

In this connection, we may inquire into Chaucer's diplomatic activities earlier in the year 1378. On March 6, 1381, according to the Issue Roll,⁸ Chaucer received payment for a mission abroad on which he had been sent in the time of Edward III and also for going to France in the reign of Richard II to negotiate a marriage between the English King and a French Princess (i. e., Isabel). On the basis of this record, Skeat plausibly suggested that Chaucer had been connected in some capacity with the royal deputation appointed January 16, 1378 (as in the French Roll),⁹ to treat in regard to this marriage, although Chaucer is not named as one of these ambassadors. The commissioners named are Sir Guischart d'Angle, Dr. Walter Skirlawe, and Sir Hugh Segrave. We find definite record in the Exchequer Accounts of the departure of the first two on this mission January 26, and they remained until May 30, 1378;¹⁰ but Segrave is not mentioned, nor is there any record

⁷ No. 121, pp. 216-17.

⁸ *Life-Records*, No. 143, pp. 230-31. Payments were not made to Chaucer for the balances of his expenses in the journey to Lombardy until November 28, 1380. See *Life-Records*, No. 140, pp. 228-29.

⁹ See Rymer's *Fœdera* (Record Edition), iv, 28.

¹⁰ Sir Guischart was employed from January 26 to May 30, Dr. Skirlawe from January 22 to May 31. See Mirot and Déprez, "Les Ambassades Anglaises," *Bibl. de L'École des Chartes*, LX (1899), Nos. CDIV and CDVI, pp. 198-99.

that he actually went on this mission. In fact, we have positive evidence that Segrave was in England on March 15, since on this date he appeared as a witness to the "grant of the reversion of the manor of Padeworth co. Berkes" to William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester.¹¹ This leads one to suspect that Segrave after being appointed was replaced or for some reason was unable to join the expedition.¹² If this be the case, the substitution of Chaucer for Segrave would explain why Chaucer's name is not included in the royal commission of 1378 and why he later received payments for making the journey. Added interest is attached to this explanation, for Sir Guischard d'Angle, as I have recently shown,¹³ was one of Chaucer's friends and was earlier associated with the poet in several other diplomatic errands.

HALDEEN BRADY

New York University

A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF CHAUCER'S *BOOKE OF THE DUCHESSE*—*LI REGRET DE GUILLAUME*
BY JEHAN DE LA MOTE

The sources of Chaucer's *Booke of the Duchesse* have been identified in considerable detail. Skeat¹ and Kittredge² have pointed out numerous parallels between Chaucer's poem and the *Roman de la Rose*, Froissart's *Paradys d'Amour*, Machaut's *Le Jugement dou Roy de Navarre*, *Le Jugement dou Roy de Behaigne*, the *Remède de Fortune*, the *Dit dou Lyon*, *La Fontaine Amoureuse*, the *Lay de Confort*, and various Motets. The source of the general plan, how-

¹¹ *Calendar of Close Rolls* (1377-1381, Ric. II), p. 126.

¹² A strikingly analogous case of another man who was appointed but who, due to some last minute arrangement, did not go occurred in February, 1377, when Sir Thomas Percy was replaced by Sir Richard Stury. Chaucer's fellow-associate in the mission to Flanders and France was, then, Sir Richard Stury. See the following footnote.

¹³ *Three Chaucer Studies*, II (Oxford University Press, 1932), pp. 28 ff., 34-39.

¹ Skeat, W. W., *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer edited from the MSS*, Second edition, Oxford, 1900.

² Kittredge, George, "Chauceriana—Booke of the Duchesse and Guillaume de Machaut," *Modern Philology* 7: 465-69 (1909-10); "Guillaume de Machaut and the Booke of the Duchesse," *PMLA*, 30: 1-24 (1915).

ever, is not so clear. Up to the present time, students of English literature have held that Chaucer's *Booke of the Duchesse* was the first poem either in French or English to use the conventional French love vision and lover's lament for the purposes of a personal elegy.³ I should like, in this paper, to call attention to a poem, hitherto not mentioned in connection with Chaucer's sources, which utilized this convention and with which I believe Chaucer to have been acquainted at least by hearsay.

In 1339, a plague year, died Guillaume, Comte de Hainault, father of Philippa, Queen of England, the mother of John of Gaunt. An elegy was written to celebrate Guillaume by a certain Jehan de la Mote.⁴ Jehan de la Mote was well known in his time as is indicated by Gilles Li Muisis, who, in his "Meditations" written in 1350, reviews contemporary French poets.⁵ He speaks first of Machaut, second of Philippe de Vitri, and mentions in the third place our Jehan de la Mote. La Mote's elegy was cast in the form of a vision, and dedicated as follows:

"Ce songe contai a ma dame,
Cui Jhesus sauve corps et ame,
Qui est roynne d'Engletiere.
Celle me commanda grant ierre
Que aucun traitié en fesisse
Sans plus a ce songe propisse.
Et jou volentiers l'acordai:
Ce traitié san plus fait en ai,
Lequel je voel rimmer tout noef,
L'an mil .iiij^e. et trente noef."

ll. 4564-73.

The poem tells how the author lay on his bed "endormant melan-colioie" and dreamed that he was in "unne haute foriest plaisant." The conventional description of the forest on a May morning is imitated from the *Roman de la Rose*. In the forest, the dreamer comes upon a beautiful castle where he hears the music of many instruments. Drawing near, he finds that the music has but

³ Kittredge, *Chaucer and his Poetry*, Cambridge, 1920, p. 54: "Here, for the first time, whether in French or English, we find the standard French convention—the love vision, and the lover's lament—turned to the uses of a personal elegy."

⁴ Jehan de la Mote, *Li Regret Guillaume, comte de Hainaut*, edited by August Scheler. Louvain, 1882.

⁵ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, xxxvi, p. 67.

drowned out cries of despair which issue forth. He gains access to the castle where there are thirty damsels, personification of thirty virtues, mourning the loss of "leur cher sire Guillaume." Each eulogizes the departed and ends her complaint with a Ballade. When the dreamer awakes, he hurries to make his vision known to Philippa as related in the closing lines.

However unlike the *Booke of the Duchesse* this may be in detail, the machinery of the elegies is identical. Both open with the plaint of a sleepless sufferer; each embodies a dream containing the elegiac lament; they are concluded by the awakening of the dreamer who hastens to reveal the vision to interested parties. There are two other points of resemblance. First, both dreams commence with a description of a forest on a May morning. But May mornings were a drug on the market in the poetry of the day, and so borrowing is by no means conclusive. The second resemblance is more promising. As can be seen from Kittredge's two articles, the lines depicting Blanche's character mark the only considerable portion of the *Booke of the Duchesse* that cannot be traced to a source. Her virtues call to mind the virtues of Guillaume, making due allowance for differences in praiseworthy qualities between the two sexes. Here are the thirty personified virtues that extol Guillaume: Debonnairété, Humilité, Largesse, Hardiesse, Prouesse, Sens, Loyauté, Manière, Mesure, Tempérance, Raison, Entendement, Suffisance, Plaisance, Diligence, Charité, Obédience, Courtoisie, Estableté, Conscience, Vrai foi, Grâce, Justice, Miséricorde, Prévoyance, Espérance, Révérence, Gentillesse, Puissance, and Perfection. He is thus beautifully inventoried. Now Chaucer was less methodical, but more imaginative and artistic. Chaucer has mixed the ingredients. One can pick out debonairite, wit, truth, steadfast perseverance, reason, and love. Lines 878-1021 of the *Booke of the Duchesse* describe Blanche. Nowhere do they contain a phrase directly borrowed from *Li Regret Guillaume*. But taken as a whole, they echo sentiments scattered throughout the various paeans of praise dedicated to Guillaume. (See especially lines 561-75; 630-32; 638-9; 672-80; 714-16; 1879-80; 2462-5; 3281-89 *Li Regret Guillaume*.)

The two poems are not sufficiently similar for me to make any positive pronouncement of Chaucer's indebtedness to Jehan de la Mote. But these facts appeal to me as worthy of consideration:

1. A personal elegy which utilized the dream mechanism was written in 1339 by a poet of some renown.

2. It celebrated the grandfather of John of Gaunt, and was dedicated to Philippa, his mother.

3. Thirty years later the plague which had carried off Guillaume de Hainault in 1339, caused the death of Guillaume's daughter and her daughter-in-law, Blanche.

4. Chaucer wrote an elegy to Blanche following the same form as the previous elegy, and not unlike it in certain descriptive passages.

I can deal only in probabilities. And it seems highly probable to me that Chaucer might have come upon *Li Regret de Guillaume* in the King's household of which he was a member. There is but one known manuscript of the poem. It is now in the Belgian Bibliothèque Nationale and has been traced back through the libraries of Lord Ashburton, Roi Louis-Philippe, and the Comte de Toulouse. Could it, or a copy since lost, have been among the volumes in the king's library to which Chaucer had access?

But if Chaucer was working from a pattern, this demands to be said concerning his craftsmanship. He has exercised the power of selection. The dream mechanism is skillfully handled. It is not a mere device as with his predecessor, but lends a dreamy, plaintive quality to the work, fusing the form with the spirit. The Old French poem is wooden and artificial, interminable in its repetitions; Chaucer's robust naturalness could not be stifled. Any comparison between the two must increase our respect for the genius of Chaucer. In any case, whether Chaucer knew *Li Regret de Guillaume* or not, it is certain that the dream vision had been used before as the vehicle for a personal elegy.

CONSTANCE L. ROSENTHAL

University of Pennsylvania

CHAUCER'S 'BOOK OF THE TWENTY-FIVE LADIES'

While engaged upon the revision and completion of my 1908 Bibliographical Manual of Chaucer, I have, of course, spent much time in examining the superb rotograph collection possessed by the University of Chicago.

The poem which we now term the 'Legend of Good Women' was mentioned by Chaucer himself, in the Recantation at the close of the Centerbury Tales, under the above title. The Recantation

is present, as we know, in all complete MSS of all types of tale-arrangement, and forms a conclusion to the Parson's Tale. It is my own opinion that the Parson's Tale was from the first intended by Chaucer as a closing narrative; also, that Chaucer may well have written his final apology, and placed it, quite early in his work. The Recantation seems to me neither a final nor a death-bed production, but a deliberately-planned conclusion, written while the Canterbury Tales was in process of arrangement, possibly even before some of the Tales which 'sounen into synne' had taken form.

One passage of the Recantation is of more than textual interest. In the list of his works which Chaucer there enumerates, for which he asks Divine forgiveness, appears the 'boke of the nyntene ladyes'; i. e. the Legend of Good Women. But 'nynetene' which Skeat (and Pollard) print, is not the reading of most manuscripts: that reading is, very generally, *twenty-five*, expressed in words, in Roman or in Arabic numerals. Harley 7334, misread 29 for the Chaucer Society, is in reality a badly-written '25'; and eighteen other of these texts read to the same effect. The Chicago rotograph of Ms Lansdowne 851 reads at this point, according to the Chaucer Society print, 'xv'; but the surface of the rotograph shows something like a fold, so that I referred the matter to my London copyist and learned that the original had indeed a wrinkle at that point. Museum officials kindly made further tests, and under reagent a second X appeared plainly in the numeral, so that the Chaucer Society print is again in error, as are all texts based thereon. Skeat may have altered the XXV usual in the Ellesmere-group manuscripts because of the content of the Legend's prologue and its mention of nineteen ladies in line 283. Whence the reading XXV was derived we do not know, but we must recollect that the allusion to the poem in the prologue to the fifteenth-century Master of Game mentions the legend by the same title as that used in the Recantation. Of the eleven copies of this hunting treatise in the British Museum, seven read 'xxv' and four, including John Shirley's copy Add. 16165, read 'xv'—or "fyfftene" in Shirley. Could this latter have been derived from such a mechanical error as is seen in Lansdowne?

We come thus to the 'more than textual interest' of this MS reading: For if "twenty-five ladies" was Chaucer's reading in an

earlier-composed version of the Recantation, and if 'nineteen ladies' was that of his revision as preserved in Ellesmere-group manuscripts, we have a fact of Chaucer's artistic development before us rather than a scribal vagary. In either case, we have a fact which no modern editor should pass unnoted.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND

Boston, Mass.

THE OWL AND THE NIGHTINGALE AND MS. COTTON

The absence of conclusive information regarding the dates of the considerable pieces of Southern English literature in the manuscripts written between 1150 and 1250, makes uncertain much of the judgments of students regarding the chronology of the literary and the linguistic features of the South in that period. Recent studies of the *Ancren Riwe*, Layamon's *Brut*, the *Proverbs of Alfred*, and the *Owl and the Nightingale*, have strengthened the feeling of myself and other students that the traditional dating of the Southern monuments is too late. But no decisive evidence fixing the dates has been forthcoming. In this situation all ascertainable details regarding any of the pieces should be accumulated.

The *Owl and the Nightingale* is preserved in two MSS., Cotton Caligula A IX (C), in the British Museum, and Jesus College, Oxford 29 (J), in the Bodleian. The earlier MS. Cotton affords the manuscript evidence more immediately helpful toward the dating of the poem. This manuscript consists of two parts originally separate—first, Layamon's *Brut*, ff. 3-194; and a second, ff. 195 to end, containing French and English pieces. It is with the second part that we are concerned.

Experts have formerly assigned the handwriting of MS. Cotton after f. 194 to the first half of the thirteenth century. The Keeper of the Manuscripts informs me that the present opinion of the Museum authorities "inclines to c. 1250" for this portion of the manuscript.

My analysis (edn. of *Owl and Nightingale*, 1907, introd.) of the features of MSS. C and J shows that the only reliable evidence other than the handwriting for dating C is the fact that the French chronicle next preceding the *Owl* stops with the death of John

(1216) and the words "Apres la mort cestu rei Johan si regna sun fiz Henri," the rest of the page (f. 232 v) being left blank. Koch suggested in his edition of Chardri's poems from these manuscripts, and I repeated the suggestion, that the blank space here was left for a later continuation of the chronicle into the reign of Henry III. Thence followed the possible inference that the chronicle was written in C at about, or a little after, Henry's accession (1216). This questionable inference receives some support from the fact that elsewhere after f. 194 the pieces, French and English, overlap from folio to folio, and no blanks are left.

But the blank at the end of the chronicle may actually be due not to a desire to leave room for a continuation, but to conditions of the copying of the miscellany of which the manuscript ff. 195 to end consists. All of the French pieces (Chardri's *La Vie de S. Josaphaz*, ff. 195-216 v; his *La Vie des set Dormanz*, ff. 216 v-229; the French chronicle, ff. 229 v-232 v; and Chardri's *Le Petit Plet*, ff. 249 v-261) are in one hand. All of the English pieces (*Owl and Nightingale*, ff. 233 r top-246 r col. 1; and minor pieces, ff. 246 r-249) are in one hand, not the hand of the French.

The Keeper of the Manuscripts informs me that the manuscript is so tightly bound that it is difficult to be absolutely sure in all instances where the quires begin and end. But the following appear to be facts. The blank space at the end of the chronicle is on the reverse of the last leaf (f. 232) of a quire. The *Owl* begins on the front of the first leaf (f. 233) of a new quire. The quire in which the *Owl* ends and which contains the other English pieces begins with f. 245; the center of this quire is between f. 252 and f. 253; and the quire ends with f. 260. The French *Le Petit Plet* begins on f. 249 r col. 2 in the midst of this quire.

The occurrence of the blank on f. 232 v at the end of the chronicle may, then, be explained as follows. The scribe of the French worked his way through the *Josaphaz* and the *Sept Dormanz*. When he came to the end of the latter he had unoccupied the reverse of a leaf (f. 229) and three more leaves (ff. 230-32) of a quire. This was not enough to hold *Le Petit Plet*. The scribe copied the French chronicle in the space, filling the quire with the exception of a part of the reverse of the last leaf (f. 232v)—a pretty close calculation. The scribe copying the English worked his way through the *Owl*

from the beginning to the end of a quire (ff. 233 r-244 v) and finished the *Owl* and the following English pieces in the midst of a quire (f. 249 r col. 1). The scribe of the French took this quire and proceeded to copy *Le Petit Plet* on it after the English pieces.

The explanation offered accounts for the fact that *Le Petit Plet* is in this manuscript separated from its two French fellows by Chardri. The three French poems follow each other in MS. J, though the order of the first two in J is reversed from that in C.

If accepted, the explanation would dispose of the idea that the blank after the chronicle was left for the specific end of a possible continuation of the chronicle into the reign of Henry III, and consequently also dispose of the inferences based on that idea that the chronicle was finished as it stands, and the copy in C made, at or about the beginning of the reign of Henry III.

Moreover, we cannot be at all sure that the chronicle was in the manuscript or the group of manuscripts from which the *Owl* and the other English and the French pieces were taken. The proposed explanation would allow for the insertion of the chronicle from a separate source to fill the space. The chronicle is not in J. The chronicle now opening the volume (ff. 1-216) known as Jesus College 29 is not a part of the manuscript making up the rest of the volume; it is later, covering the years 900-1445.

The facts about the chronicle, therefore, afford merely this—that C was copied after 1216. If, as the experts judge, the handwritings are of c. 1250, the copying may have been done at any time between 1216 and 1250, preferably later in this period.

I have shown (edn., introd.) that the manuscript from which the *Owl* in C was copied is the one from which the *Owl* in J was copied, and that it was itself a copy, not the author's copy. Koch showed that the Chardri poems in C are copied there from a copy, not an author's copy. We must, then, in calculating for the date of the original manuscripts of the *Owl* and the Chardri poems assume an extreme latest limit of c. 1250, and from this must subtract such time as we wish to allow for the author's originals to be copied not under the authors' own eyes, and to be recopied as C and J. How long we allow depends on our personal choice. There seems to be no sign that the manuscripts of the *Owl*, C and J and their predecessors, got out of the Southern district, the evident home of the author's original. The *Thrush and the Nightingale* (before 1272),

assumed to have been influenced by the *Owl*, is Southern. Moreover, there seems to be no indication that any copy intervened between the author's original and the manuscript from which the *Owl* in C and J was copied. The general excellence of the text of the *Owl* in C, and the comparative consistency shown there even within the sections exhibiting the shift of spelling, oppose much recopying. Consequently, one may be inclined to shorten the time allowed for the copying of the several manuscripts.

JOHN EDWIN WELLS

Connecticut College

'SCRIBAL PREFERENCE' IN THE OLD ENGLISH
GLOSS TO THE LINDISFARNE GOSPELS

In modern philology much use is made of statistical methods. There is a certain habit of scribes, tending to distort the statistics and thus leading to false conclusions, which does not appear to have been sufficiently noticed. It may be well explained and illustrated by some examples from the Old English gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*.¹

A scribe sometimes has a preference for an abnormal form of a word. The most obvious case is the following: he makes use of an abnormal form in one part of the text and, still under the influence of this action, he uses it again in the immediately succeeding parts of the text. Examples from the *Lindisfarne Gospels* are:—

1). The spelling *æ* for the sound [e:] is abnormal in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*; ^{2a} in J 8, 6 this abnormal spelling is used in the form 3rd. sg. pres. ind. *ghænas* and this is closely followed by inf. *ghæne* in J 8, 10.

2). The normal form of the acc. sg. of weak masculine and feminine nouns in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* ends in *-a*; forms in *-o* are also found and *-u* can occur as an archaism ² for this *-o*. The

¹ Quotations are from the edition in W. W. Skeat, *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian Versions*, corrected by a fresh collation of the manuscript.

^{2a} In the whole text it is recorded less than half a dozen times.

² In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* archaisms occur in c. 1.5% of the total number of forms.

abnormal accusative singular *sidu* occurs J 19, 34, also twice in J 20, 20 and once in J 20, 25. Similarly the acc. sg. *folo* occurs in Mt 19, 32, twice in Mt 19, 33 and once in Mt 19, 35.

In such cases the reason for the 'scribal preference' is obvious. But in others all that we can say is that the scribe has a preference for an abnormal form for no apparent reason. It may be noted that this preference is not usually for an erroneous form but only for one which is otherwise abnormal, very frequently for an archaism. Examples from the *Lindisfarne Gospels* are:—

1). In most of the very early Old English texts the spelling *b* for normal O. E. *f* representing the sound [b] is found.³ In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* the occurrence of this archaism is virtually limited to the words ⁴ *ebolsiga*, *ebolsung* ⁵ and here there is a marked preference for it (21 *b* : 4 *f*).

2). The spelling *ui* for normal *y* occurs sporadically in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*,⁶ e. g. sg. pret. ind. *tocnuicte* Mt. Preface p. 8, line 15; sg. pret. ind. *gefulgide* Mt. Preface p. 3, line 3. But in the words *bær-synnig* ⁷ (4 *ui* : 17 *y*) and *syndrig* (13 *ui* : 7 *y*) it is disproportionately frequent.

3). The spelling *o* for normal *w* occurs very occasionally in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* but in the word *ðwā* it is disproportionately frequent.⁸

³ See E. Sievers, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 11, 542.

⁴ In the word *feber* the spelling with *b* is due to the direct influence of the Latin; cf. the spelling *caesar* beside *cāser*, the normal form in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*.

⁵ The first element of O. E. *eofolsian* is the same as that in Gothic *ibdalja*, *ibuks* and the second is the verb O. E. *hālsian*; see J. Pokorny and A. Walde, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 1, 123.

⁶ See further M. Förster, *Englische Studien*, 56, 220 ff.

⁷ In *Rushworth*⁸ the form *bear-swinig* occurs six times; the scribe of this text admittedly had access to the glossed text of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (see U. Lindelöf, *Die südnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, p. 3) and it is probable that this form is ultimately due to a misunderstanding of the form *bærsuinnig* in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*; the scribe has interpreted the ambiguous spelling *ui* as representing a consonant plus a vowel instead of a single vowel. Lindelöf (*op. cit.*, Par. 72, Note 1) suggests that the word has been associated with the word 'swine' by folk-etymology.

⁸ See K. Bülbring, *Anglia Beiblatt*, 10, 368.

4). The spelling *u* occurs as an archaism for *o* in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*;² in the words *eorðo* (22 *u* : 67 *o*), *hwelc-*, *hwot-hwoego* (7 *u* : 10 *o*) and *heono* (60 *u* : 96 *o*) it is disproportionately frequent.

5). The spelling *o* occurs as an archaism for *a* in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*;² in the gen. pl. of the word *monn* (6 *o* : 25 *a*) it is disproportionately frequent.

6). The spelling *i* occurs as an archaism for *e* in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*;² in the 2nd. and 3rd. sg. pres. ind. of the verb *habba* (32 *i* : 71 *e*) it is disproportionately frequent.

7). In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* there is a variation between *a* and *e* in the spelling of the vowels of flexional syllables with normal O. E. *a*;³ the spelling with *e* is disproportionately frequent in the nom. acc. pl. of the word *diowl* (14 *-es* : 20 *-as*) and in the inf. of the word *ondrēda* (15 *e* : 1 *a*).

8). Final *n* has in general been lost in the weak declension of nouns and adjectives in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*; its occurrence as an archaism is virtually limited to one word, *ðirda* and here no less than 5 forms with *n* occur as against 17 without.

ALAN S. C. ROSS

Leeds, England

THE NED: WORDS OF DIVINATION AND ONOMATOPOEIC TERMS

At the beginning of the nineteenth chapter of his *Magastromancer* (1652), John Gaule presents a veritable dictionary of divination. It is his purpose, shrowded "in some kind of twilight" from the Magastromancer's sun, to light his own candle and expose the awful tribe; and though it is his intention not to "flourish in a wild circuit of words, but [come] close to the matter at hand," he gives stupendous lists, of which this is one: fifty-five words ending in *-mancy*.

One might suppose his list complete; but the *New English Dictionary* shows how Lydgate and others were before and after Gaule in their interest in almost 100 kinds of divination going back,

³ The forms in *e* constitute about 7% of the total number showing a variation *a/e*.

often, to ancient times. An amazing variety of authors and reviews were interested—Chaucer, Gower, Langland, Lydgate; Holinshed, Greene, Jonson; Purchas, More, Browne, Hobbes; Smedley, Southey, Scott, Taylor; writers in the *Philosophical Transactions* and *Edinburgh Review* and numerous nineteenth century journals—, but it is perhaps significant (a little “index to the times”) that ministers and writers of the Restoration Era (and somewhat before and after) especially took these words seriously, whereas the nineteenth century attitude seems antiquarian.

Likewise the lexicographers, Cotgrave and Cockeram, Bailey, (Johnson' noticeably missing), Ash, Chambers (encyclopedia), Roget (thesaurus), and most of all Blount (1656), were assiduous; but second only to Gaule, and not second to him in the matter of artistic treatment, was, of course, Sir Thomas Urquhart in his translation (bk. iii, ch. 25, 1693) of Rabelais.

About one-third of the *-mancy* words are marked “Obs.” in the Oxford Dictionary. At least a few—*collimancy*, *frontimancy*, &c.—are mere inventions; others seem unreal, and, except for *necromancy* and two or three more, the suffix is today quite remote and isolated. A few words or forms with *-mancy* escaped readers for the *NED* or got lost in the Scriptorium. They are those italicized in a list which may possibly interest some readers. Two are clearly misprints; so seemingly *antinopomancy* for *anthropomancy* also; the writer can only put a query as to *choiramancy*, or *choiromancy*, and *roadomancy*. W. F. Smith has footnotes in his translation of Rabelais (1893). *Nagomancy* appears to be Gaule's variant for *necromancy*. Books on Spirits by Balthazar Bekker (1695), Meric Casaubon (1672), and others contain further interesting details. Indeed, the subject is large.

adryomancy (under suffix in <i>NED</i>)	axinomancy, balanced hatchet
aeromancy, appearances in air; see <i>chaomancy</i>	belomancy, arrows, rods
alectoromancy, alectryomancy, cock picking up grains	bibliomancy, verses in book (Bible)
aleuromancy, meal	botanomancy, herbs
alphaltomancy, barley-meal	caseinomancy, sieves (Gaule)
anthropomancy, entrails	catoptromancy, mirrors
<i>antinopomancy</i> (misprint?)	cattabomancy, vessels of brass
arithmancy, numbers	cephaleonomancy, brayling of ass's head (improper form)
astragalomancy, dice; see <i>cleromancy</i>	capnomancy, smoke from altar
austromancy, winds	ceromancy, wax and water

chaomancy, appearances in air
 chartomancy, writing
 cheromancy, bean in cake
 (Urquhart—misprint)
 chiromancy, palmistry
 choiramancy, hogs—bladders
 (Urquhart; *choiromancy*?)
 cleidomancy, keys
 cleromancy, dice
 collimancy (under suffix)
 coscinomancy, balanced sieve
 cristallomantia, spirits in a magic
 lens, glasses
 crithomancy, dough or cakes
 dactyliomancy, suspended ring
 dæmonomancy, demons' help
 daphnomancy, laurel tree
 enoptromancy, mirrors
 frontimancy (under suffix)
 fysenancy (under suffix)
 gastromancy, ventriloquism
 geomancy, lots at random
 graptomancy, handwriting
 gyromancy, walking in circles
 halomancy, salt
 hieromancy, entrails of animals
 hydromancy, water
 ichthyomancy, entrails of fishes
 idolomancy, idols, figures
 lampadomancy, candles, lamps
 lecanomancy, basin of water
 libanomancy, burning of incense
 lithomancy, precious stones
 livanomancy (err. for *libanomancy*)
 logarithmancy, logarithmes
 machæromancy, knives, swords
 magastromancy (Gaule's invention)
 meteoromancy, meteors
 metopomancy, forehead or face
 myomancy, movements of mice
 nagomancy, necromancy
 natimancy (under suffix in *NED*)
 necromancy
 nomancy, onomancy, oino-, æno-,
 letters forming name of person

omphelomancy, navel
 oneiromancy, dreams
 onomatomancy, onomancy (Gaule,
 Urquhart)
 onychomancy, nails reflecting sun's
 rays
 onymancy (shortened form of *ony-
 chromancy*), oil and wax
 ophiomancy, fishes, serpents
 ornithomancy, augury, birds
 oromancy, faeces
 osteomancy, bones
 pædomancy, feet (err. for *pedo-
 mancy*)
 (pantomancers—Gaule)
 pegomancy, fountains
 pessomancy, pebbles
 pseudomancy, false divination
 psychomancy, souls
 pyromancy, fire
 rhabdomancy, wand
 rhapsodomancy, passages of a poet
 at hazard; cp. *bibliomancy*, *sticho-
 mancy*
roadomancy, "by starres" (Gaule)
 scatomancy, faeces
 schematomancy, forms
 sciomancy, shadows, manes
 sideromancy, (1) red-hot iron, (2)
 stars
 spasmatomancy, twitchings of limbs
 spatalamancy, skins, bones, excre-
 ments (note on Gaule)
 stareomancy, elements
 sternomancy, breast to belly
 stichomancy, passages in books
 sycomancy, figs, fig-leaves
 tephromancy, writings in ashes
 theomancy, oracles
 theriomancy, movement of animals
 thumomancy, soul; see *psychomancy*
 tuphramancy (see *tephromancy*)
 tyromancy, cheese
 ur (in) omancy, urin

As John Willcock points out in his life of Urquhart (1899, p.

203), the translator amplifies Rabelais almost in an 8 : 1 proportion in a passage (bk. iii, ch. 13, 1693) amazing for its onomatopoeic terms. In view of remarks by H. B. Wheatley in his *Dictionary of Reduplicated Words* (1865), H. Wedgwood in a *Philological Society* article (1845), Louise Pound (*Nebraska Studies*, 1913), and elsewhere, this passage in Urquhart may be taken as an interesting test-passage, and a few notes submitted.

Rabelais had 9 animals and their cries or calls; his translator increased to 71. Six of these apparently are not in the *NED*, but of those that are, 12 are marked "*Obs.*" and 2, "*nonce*"—Urquhart's own; 14 or 15 are "imitative," 14 are "echoic," 5 are "frequentatives," 1 is "from the sound," 1 is "reduplicative," 1 is "diminutive," and practically all the others are doubtfully onomatopoeic. Oldest in our vocabulary (from this list) are *neigh* (8th century) and *roar* (1000); 4 date from the 13th century, 13 from the 14th, 10 from the 15th, 12 from the 16th, and 11 from the 17th.

Especially interesting are the sounds and sound-combinations: [b] 5, [bl] 1, [br] 1, [k] 8 (*curkling* of Quails, *curring* of Pigeons, *kekling* of Hens), [tf] 7 (*charming* of Beagles, *chirring* of Linets), [s] 5 (including consonant combinations), [kl] 3, [kr] 8 (*cricking* of Ferrets, *crouting* of Cormorants), [dr] 1 (*drinkling* of Turkeys), [fr] 1 (*frantling* of Peacocks, *nonce-word*), [g]? 4 (*girning* of Boars—metathesis of *r*, *guerieting* of Apes, *gushing* of Hogs), [gr] 2 (*grumbling* of Cushet-doves), [h] 3 (*hissing*, *howling*, *humming*), [m] 4 (especially *mumbling* of Rabets, *mioling* ["*miauling*"] of Tygers), [n] 2 (*neighing* and *nuzzing*—Camels), [p] 2, [pr] 1, [km] 2, [r] 3, [sn] 2, [sk] 2, [w] 3, [m] 2, and [j] 2—initial sounds only.

It seems that Urquhart wrote "crying of Elephants," whereas a later ed. (1737) imitates the French "*barrient les elephants*"—"barring of Elephants"; our word (so W. F. Smith, 1893) is *trumpeting*. Where Rabelais has "*abayent*," Urquhart has "*barking of Currs*"; so "*siflent les serpens*"—"hissing," "*hannissent*"—"neighing," "*lamentent les tourterelles*"—"wailing," "*vllent [sic] les loups*"—"yelling." Two terms Urquhart overlooked, "*braisient les asnes*" and "*sonnent les cigales*." These comparisons gain in interest if one looks at a note under *cackling* in the

NED or recalls Mr. Wedgwood's statement about not finding similar onomatopoeic words in cognate languages.

Notwithstanding the ingeniousness of Urquhart, most of his terms are common. He could not have used Cotgrave extensively here, although in addition to Rabelais' 9 words there is "cigaler" for the cicada, "Locusts"; his transferred use of *coniating* for storks is likewise engaging. His imagination was more than sufficient. But see Sir William Craigie: two articles in *Sat. Rev. of Lit.* 4.792 and in *Eng. Jnl.* May 1929.

Apparently the *NED* does not have *clamring* ("clamring of Scarfes"), *drintling*, *guarring* (mispr. for *gnarring*, obs. in sense of "growling," with dates 1592 and 1600 only in *NED*?), *guerieting* (Apes), *pioling* (Pelicans), and *rammage* (Hawks). 1816 is the earliest date for *boo*—"boing of Buffalos" writes Urquhart. The *NED* of course has *gush*, *gushing*, but seemingly not the knight's sense (above).

EDWIN BERCK DIKE

University of Edinburgh

NEW EVIDENCE FOR MIDDLE ENGLISH *þef*

In a Latin life of St. Wallevus or Waltheof or Walthef there is a curious bit of evidence for the substantive *þef*, which, as far as I know, has hitherto been noted only in *Genesis and Exodus*,¹ an uninspired work assigned to the southern border of the East Midland district and dated about 1250. The meaning of the word thus recorded is "taste," as is clear from the context:

To dust he it grunden and maden bread,
ðat huni and olies ðef he bead.

Bradley connected it with O. N. *þefr*, which is glossed as "smell"² though we should note that taste and smell are not clearly differentiated sensations, as is shown by the history of "savor."

Waltheof or Walthef was a son of Matilda, a grand-niece of William I, and Simon, Earl of Huntingdon in his wife's right. Matilda made a second marriage with David I of Scotland, to whom she brought the English earldom. Her son Waltheof, named

¹ V. 3340. MS. Corp. Chr. Coll., Camb., 444. Ed. R. Morris, EETS 7.

² See Vigfusson-Cleasby for this form and the related verb *þefja*, *þefa*, "to smell."

for his maternal grandfather, became a monk and after various preferments died as Abbot of Melrose in 1160. His *vita* was written by a monk of Furness, named Joscelyn or Jordan, about whom I have no information. The *vita* has been found in two MSS.: (1) that one "in Coenobio Bodecensi Canonicorum Regularium" in the diocese of Paderborn, which the Bollandists printed in A. SS. 3 Aug. I, 249, and (2) MS. Gale, Trin. Coll., Camb., O. x. 25.³ Since the work was dedicated to William, King of Scotland, who died in 1214, it was clearly written not later than the early years of the thirteenth century. According to the fashion of the period, the name of the saint is played with etymologically: "Nomen vero istud Anglice dissyllabum est cuius syllaba secunda si correpto accentu proferatur *Electus Sapor*; si producto, *Electus Latro* interpretatur."⁴ "Electus Latro" was understood by the Bollandists, but of "Electus Sapor" they could give no explanation.

The first syllable of the name is connected by Joscelyn with M. E. *wālen*, *wēlen*, "to choose," equivalent to O. N. *velja*, O. H. G. *wellen*, N. H. G. *wählen*, Gothic *waljan*. The word is not recorded in O. E., though Björkman listed it, quite properly, among those that may well have been in use before the Scandinavian invasions. "Electus" is a fair equivalent. Now, if the vowel of the second syllable of Waltheof or Walthef be taken as long—"producto accentu"—we have *pēof* or *pēf*. Joscelyn had merely to use a little ingenuity in showing that the sainted abbot was a chosen thief of heaven by means of his activities on earth. If the second syllable of his name, on the other hand, be short—"correpto accentu"—we get *pef*, a precise equivalent of *sapor*, "taste, savor," as is shown by the passage in *Genesis and Exodus*, and evidence for the use of the word considerably earlier than has hitherto been supposed. Since Abbot Walthef's reputation was made in the North, where he passed most of his life, it is reasonable to believe that the man who wrote his *vita* was accustomed to Northern forms of English. *Pef* is thus attested as a word in general circulation. Since John of

³ See T. D. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials*, II, 285.

⁴ I quote from the A. SS. 3 Aug. I, 251-252. Though I have not seen the text of the Camb. MS., I cannot believe that it differs, since the play on words survives in John of Tynemouth's *Sanctilogium Angliae* of the 14th century.

Tynemouth rewrote the passage of Latin in the fourteenth century, retaining "sapor" without explanation, and since his text was printed without further alteration in the *Nova Legenda Angliae* ⁵ as late as 1516, I think we are safe in assuming that *pef* continued in use along with taste and savor throughout the Middle English period. Since O. N. *pefr* means "smell" rather than "taste," may it not also be assumed that *pef* was known in O. E.? We cannot be sure of this, since the two words would be close to one another in meaning, but we may, I think, regard it as a probability. At all events, the root appears before the Norman Conquest, since it must be noted that *pefian*, "to pant, to be agitated," and *of-pefian*, "to be exceedingly heated," are found in O. E. prose. I confess that I do not now see the connection in meaning of these verbs with *pef*, but unquestionably they rest on the same foundation.

GORDON HALL GEROULD

Princeton University

AS GOOD CHEPE

The phrase "as good chepe" which occurs in *Troilus and Criseyde*, III, 641, is not altogether clear:

She thoughte, as good chepe may I dwellen here,
And graunte it gladly with a frendes chere,
And have a thonk, as grucche and thanne abide;
For hom to gon, it may not wel bitide.

Root makes no comment on this particular passage nor does Skeat (who reads "chep"). The latter gives the meaning "as cheaply" in his glossary (cf. Oxford Chaucer, VI, 45) but though this was undoubtedly the most usual meaning in Middle English, it makes but little sense in the present context.

OE *cēap* commonly meant "bargain, buying, selling, purchase, price," and the word was also used in this sense in Middle English, this in fact being its almost exclusive meaning. In this specific case, however, the word is not to be understood in the usual commercial sense (numerous examples of which are to be found in the NED) but rather in a figurative way. The NED supports this

⁵ Ed. C. Horstmann, II, 406.

suggestion, for under "cheap" the sixth usage is explained as the "state of the market, qualified from the buyer's point of view as *good, dear*, etc. *Good cheap*: a state of the market *good* for the purchaser. . . ." The explanation is continued under 8: "*good cheap* was used for: that is a good bargain, that can be purchased on advantageous terms"; and finally under 9 b: "on good terms, with little effort; cheaply, easily."

In this light the passage in the *Troilus* may very properly be rendered: "as much to my advantage may I remain here . . . as complain and then stay" or "I can as easily," "I may as well," etc. The figurative meaning seems the more desirable and the phrase may be glossed "as easily," "as well." With this interpretation the line at least makes sense; the Skeat gloss, if not entirely incorrect in this instance, is certainly unnecessarily misleading. Incidentally this figurative use of "as good chepe" antedates by nearly two centuries the earliest example (1567-9) noted in the NED.

THOMAS A. KIRBY

The Johns Hopkins University

AN. *Mainpast*

An unusual example of AN. *mainpast*, which is generally a substantive and which commonly refers only to human beings, occurs in Bodleian MS. Rawlinson C. 459, fo. 216 r, in a *Curia Baronis* of the reign of Edward III (1327-1377), where it appears as an adjective qualifying dogs. Its use implies that these dogs are a part of their owner's household, and that he is legally responsible for their acts as he is for those of his children and servants (to whom the word is usually applied).

Ceo vous moustre T qi cy est etc. de R qiloeques est qatort ses .ij. chiens mainpast viendrent . . . et en sa faude entrèrent et ses bestes illoeques trouez morderent . . . (T. who is here etc. shows you of R. who is there, that wrongly his two dogs mainpast came and entered his fold and bit his animals [sheep] which were there.)

ELSIE SHANKS

The Johns Hopkins University

SOME BLANK VERSE WRITTEN BY THOMAS NORTON
BEFORE "GORBODUC"

There have hitherto been recognized some dozen appearances of blank verse before Marlowe adopted this meter in *Tamburlaine*. Of these, only two antedate *Gorboduc*: Surrey's *Æneid*, Books II and IV; Nicholas Grimald, *The Death of Zoroas* (115 lines) and *Marcus Tullius Ciceroes Death* (88 lines) in Tottel's *Songes and Sonnettes*, 1557.¹

After *Gorboduc* (1562) blank verse was used again, in 1566, by Gascoigne and Kinwelmershe in *Jocasta*, and seems here to have had *Gorboduc* as a direct influence. The connections, however, between the verse of *Gorboduc* and earlier blank verse have been much more vague.

It is of some interest, then, to find that Thomas Norton, in translating Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, decided to use blank verse as a means of rendering into English the portions of Virgil which had been quoted by Calvin. Norton's translation of Calvin's work was first published on May 6, 1561; *Gorboduc* was presented for the first time at Christmas in 1561. It is fairly certain that Norton had completed his translation before *Gorboduc* was written: this is commonly accepted as a fact on the basis of the difference between the above dates; and since *Gorboduc* was composed to provide "furniture of part of the grand Christ-masse in the Inner Temple,"² it seems that Sackville and Norton must have written the play fairly late in 1561.

In the fifth chapter of Book I of the *Institutes* Calvin quotes from Virgil's *Æneid*, Book VI, lines 724-731. Norton translates this passage as follows:

Fyrst heauen, and earth, and flovvyng fieldes of seas,
The shynyng globe of Moone, and Titans starres,
Sprite fedes vvithin, and throughout all the lymmes
Infused mynde the vvhole huge masse dooth moue,
And vvith the large bigge body mixe it selfe.
Thense come the kyndes of men and eke of beastes,

¹ Cf. C. F. Tucker Brooke, "Marlowe's Versification and Style," *S.P.*, XIX, 186. Professor Brooke's article contains a list of the early examples of blank verse.

² "The Printer to the Reader," John Day's edition of *Gorboduc*, 1570.

And lyues of flyng foules, and monsters straunge,
 That vvater beares vvithin the marble sea.
 A fyry lyuelynesse and heauenly race there is
 VVithin those seedes. &c.³

And Calvin quotes immediately after this from the *Georgics*, Book IV, lines 219-227, which are translated by Norton:

Some say that bees haue part of mynde diuine,
 And heauenly draughtes. For eke they say, that God
 Gothe through the coastes of lande, and creakes of sea,
 And through depe skye. And hense the flockes and heardes:
 And men, and all the kyndes of sauage beastes,
 Eche at their byrthe receyue theyr suttle lyues.
 And therto are they rendred all at laste,
 And all resolued are retournde agayne.
 Ne place there is for deathe: but lyuely they
 Flye into nombre of the Starres aboue,
 And take their place vvithin the lofty skye.³

These lines are decidedly good examples of early blank verse. They follow Virgil closely. The plural form in "Titans starres" is apparently a misprint, for the reference is obviously to the sun. But if the lines are close translation they are formed into solid pentameter units, and the accents are under perfect control. Probably the remarkable thing about them is the number of run-on lines, for lines containing pure *enjambement* are rare in early blank verse. The rather strange run-on principle doubtless explains the misplacing of the extra foot in the next to the last line of the passage from the *Aeneid*.

The real interest in these passages is, of course, the indication that Norton knew and esteemed Surrey's version of the *Aeneid*, Books II and IV. These twenty-one lines may be regarded as the missing link between Surrey's blank verse and the blank verse of *Gorboduc*.

HOWARD BAKER

Berkeley, California

* These passages are reproduced from the first edition of Norton's translation, the copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library.

REVISION IN MUNDAY'S *JOHN A KENT AND
JOHN A CUMBER*

Anthony Munday's play of *John a Kent and John a Cumber* exists in a single manuscript in Munday's autograph with his signature at the end. There is no known edition of the play before that prepared in 1851 by J. P. Collier for the Old Shakespeare Society. His work was scarcely satisfactory, however, for he barely touched on the background and misread the text at many points.¹ In 1912 Farmer prepared a facsimile in his series of Tudor Facsimile Texts, and in 1923 the Malone Society issued a print of it prepared by Miss Muriel St. Clare Byrne, who gives in her introduction a complete description of the manuscript. There has not, however, been a detailed study of the state of the text, and the evidence that it gives for revision. Careful analysis convinces us that this play, like many another one of the Elizabethan period, shows distinct signs of revision, particularly in the excision of certain themes.

The text is a fair copy, used or prepared for use in the playhouse. There are a few corrections of no particular importance except as they show us the play developing in Munday's hands. There is a brief marginal addition at line 151, a passage obviously and awkwardly put in to serve as preparation for the advent of Llewelyn; and there are several minor deletions, perhaps designed to speed up the play: one of Cumber's taunts to his rival is cut out (958-9); Kent's meditation is cut short (1009-11); a whole speech of Cumber's is marked for omission, with a consequent gap before Hugh's speech which follows (1060-68); and Powesse loses a speech (1340-44).²

¹ The extent of his misreadings can be seen from the notes to Miss Byrne's edition for the Malone Society, 1923.

² There are also cancellations of words or phrases within lines: 159, 160, 394, 471, 483, 896, 931, 932, 1000, 1010, 1052, 1108, 1186, 1226, 1447, 1476, which show that Munday was copying rapidly from another manuscript and caught himself now and then making a mistake, or that he revised chance errors as he composed. Much the same type of error is apparent in his confusion of Powesse and Pembroke in the speech headings at lines 598 and 659; and of Morton and Griffith at 943 and 1243. The omission of the exit speeches of Powesse, Griffith, and Kent at 1570-76 and of the Countess, Sidanen, and Marian, 1597-1602, prevents an anticlimax after the long

A second group of corrections, however, is of far greater significance, and is indicative of much fuller excision, the exact nature of which can only be surmised. In the stage directions at lines 470 and 1295 Evan's name is deleted. As the play now stands Evan has no real function in it. He appears in the first scene as a companion to Denvyll and offers his forces to Powys and Merri-dock:

And I threescore as strong, with hookes and billes
that to three hundred will not turn their backs. (92-93.)

Thereafter he makes only five speeches in the play, the most extensive of them eight lines long and none of them of any importance in the development of the action.³ In the first scene of the fourth act he is present at the abduction of the ladies, but plays no part in that action other than to remark,

Listen my Lodes, me thinkes I hear the chyme,
which Iohn did promise, ere you should presume;
to venture for recouerie of the ladyes (1139-41.)

and is left without any companion as the others pair off with the ladies and "turn" off the stage. In two instances his name was included in scene headings but was then cancelled. In the latter of these, however (at l. 1295), he still has a speech in the course of the scene:

Into the Castell then, and frollique there.
I know that Iohn will not stay long behinde,
since your successe dooth answere thus his mynde. (1326-8.)

Finally, at line 1447 he enters mute. He is neither in nor out of the play.

That revision was not confined to simplifying the rôle of Evan but was much more extensive is indicated by the presence of Sir Gosselin Denvyll and by his relations with Kent. Denvyll, too, is an unimportant figure. He speaks more frequently than Evan,⁴ it is true, and his castle serves as a place of refuge for the runaway

speech of Kent in the one instance and of Cumber in the other. At 608-610 the speech of the First Servant has been deleted evidently to avoid an extra speaking part.

³ Ll. 747-54, 833-4, 849-55, 1139-41, 1326-28.

⁴ Lines 64-6, 87, 90-91, 102-7, 124, 510-15, 741-6, 767-72, 995-8, 1132-4, 1142-4, 1156-7, 1297-1301, 1528-31, 1550-52 or 54.

lovers and hence as a scene for much of the play, but his speeches are trivial dramatically, and the lovers could as plausibly have escaped to either Griffin's or Powys' castle. The really noteworthy problem, however, is that of Denvyll's relations with Kent. Although throughout the play the magician appears as a free agent, yet on several occasions he refers to Denvyll as his master.⁵

Associated with this puzzle is the way in which Kent, Denvyll, and Evan are introduced to us. John appears, accompanied by the other two, as a thief:

welcom[e] Gentlemen, you seeme no lesse,
be not offended at my salutations,
that bid ye stand, before I say God speed.
ffor in playne tearmes, speed what your speed may be,
Such coyne you haue, bothe must and shall with me. (68-71.)

Again, at lines 303 ff. Griffin and Powesse exclaim about his disguise:

S. Griffin. See Powesse, heers Iohn a Kent, dect in
a Pilgrimes weede
Powesse. why how now Iohn? turnd greene to ffryers
grey?

Is it implied that Kent was accustomed to appear in the "Lincoln green" associated with the costumes of outlaws like Robin Hood and his men? That that is the implication is indicated by the subsequent dialog.

Iohn what madness makes ye come so farre this way?
The town's beset, our purpose is descryde
and now I see your cōming made all spyde.
S. Griffin. help vs to scape vnto thy maisters caue.

It might well be an echo from "Adam Bell" or some other outlaw ballad. Are John and his master then gentlemanly outlaws with a cave as their home? If that be true, why is it that everywhere else in the play we hear of Denvyll's castle, and see it in the succeeding scenes? Obviously there is a real inconsistency here. Couple this with the erratic appearance of Evan, who, it will be recalled, is associated with these two, and we have evidence that the story has not always been the simple one that it is as the play now stands.

There are two possible explanations. (1) It is possible that we

⁵ Lines 82, 85, 308, 885, 999, 1093, 1253.

have echoes of old ballads, traditional features that Munday incorporated simply because they were a part of the tradition and he neglected to eliminate them. (2) Or it is possible that these features are shreds of an older form of the play, perhaps a more elaborate form, with Kent appearing in the double rôle of apprentice or journeyman outlaw and master magician and with Denvyll and Evan playing a much more important part than they do in the present form of the play? Which of these is the most probable explanation it is impossible to say with certainty, except that the virtual excision of Evan as a character and the brevity of the play (it contains only 1705 lines) point toward revision.

In either case the material in the earlier part of the play embodies certain conventions of outlaw stories. First, on occasion outlaws were represented as aiding true lovers and using disguise to outwit the rival lovers. In "Robin Hood and Allen a Dale,"⁶ for instance, the situation is much like that implied in *Kent*. Allen, held up by "Brave Little John and Nick the miller's son," is brought to Robin, to whom he tells his tale of woe: his lady is to be married to an old knight. When the lad promises to be Robin's servant, the latter undertakes to get the bride for him. Here there is no delay or indirection as in *Kent*. Robin goes straight to the church, where he poses to the bishop as a harper, very brusquely takes the "finikin lass" from the old knight, and bestows her on Allen. Disguise in a romantic story of this type is found again in "Robin Hood and the Prince of Aragon," where Robin, Little John, and Scadlock, having put on "mothly gray," take long staves and scrip and bottle as if they were, not hermits, but palmers, and eventually save the princess from a loathsome marriage with the Prince of Aragon.⁷

⁶ F. J. Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*. Boston, 1882-98. No. 138.

⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 129. Disguise, though without the romantic motive, appears frequently in the stories of Eustace the Monk (summarized in Thomas Wright's *Essays Connected with the Literature, Popular Superstitions, and History of England in the Middle Ages*, London, 1846, II, 121-46. Francisque Michel's edition of the *Roman d'Eustache le Moine, pirate fameux du XIII^e siècle, publié pour la première fois d'après un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque royale*, Paris, 1834, was not accessible to me) of Fulke Fitz Warin (Wright, II, 147-63 and in Joseph Stevenson's "Legend of Fulk Fitz-Warin" in his edition of *Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon*

Secondly, outlaws were commonly represented as being beset in a town by their enemies, a situation implied in ll. 303 ff. The case of Adam Bell and his two companions has already been mentioned.⁸ Robin Hood and his cronies are continually running their heads into nooses,⁹ and Johnie Armstrong's last valiant stand¹⁰ and Gamelyn's visit to his hostile brother's court¹¹ show much the same convention.

Thirdly, it may be only a coincidence or it may represent a convention that we have three figures associated in the play: Kent, Denvyll, and Evan, and that frequently the outlaws appear in trios in the ballads and traditional tales: Robin, Little John, and Nick; Robin, Little John and Scadlock; Adam Bell, Clim of the Clough, and William of Cloudesly; Hereward and the two Siwards.

When we add to these conventional outlaw features which appear in the play: Kent's half jocular "stand and deliver,"¹² the employment of the bows and bills as well as the wits of Denvyll and Evans,¹³ Kent's disguise, with the accompanying reference to his customary dress of green¹⁴ and the implied danger of the three in enemy territory,¹⁵ when we add to these the fact that, as Collier pointed out,¹⁶ there is in Captain Johnson's *Lives of the High-*

Anglicanum in the Rolls Series, London, 1875, pp. 275-415) and of Hereward (Wright, II, 91-120 and T. D. Hardy and C. T. Martin, *Lestorie des Engles solum la Translacion Maistre Geffrei Gaimar*, Rolls Series, London, 1888, I, pp. 339-404.). In all these cases the disguise is used either to help the outlaw to escape from his enemies or to enable him to play some trick upon them. Hence it is often associated with a situation in which he finds himself caught or nearly caught in the midst of his adversaries, such a situation as is implied in Kent's rebuke of Griffin and Powesse.

⁸ Child, No. 116.

⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 117 (The Fyftth Fytte), 119, 133 (with Robin disguised as a beggar), 140 (with Robin disguised as a palmer).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 169.

¹¹ W. W. Skeat, *The Tale of Gamelyn*, ed. 2. Oxford, 1893, lines 711-726.

¹² Ll. 68-71. Reminiscent of Robin Hood's willingness to fight with every comer is Kent's subsequent statement,

"Mr. These are the guests you looke for, whom had I not well
gest at,

They had for welcome got a cudgelling." (85-6.)

¹³ Ll. 90-93.

¹⁴ Ll. 302-9.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Old Shakespeare Society Publications*, No. 47, pp. xx-xxi.

waymen a life of Sir Gosselen Denville, "who was accustomed to rob travellers, and who is said to have flourished in the reign of Edward II,"¹⁷ it becomes reasonably certain that one stratum of the play, almost hidden by Munday, rests on outlaw material, gained either from ballads and folk tales or from an earlier form of the play—or both.

That the present text of the play is one prepared for production is indicated by two facts: the presence of hypermetrical lines resulting from the addition of a word or words (often a vocative) to make the dialog more like natural speech or to run the speeches together more rapidly; and the presence of anticipatory stage directions inserted in the left hand margin of the sheets by a hand which has been identified as that of the "playhouse scribe" of *Sir Thomas More*.¹⁸

The additions are usually quite simple. For instance, it is probable that lines 13 and 14, which now read

Powesse. yea, so Pembroke hath their graunte for Marian:

But.

S. Griffin. But what? Euen while we thus stand wasting
idle woordes,

originally read

Powesse. so Pembroke hath their graunt for Marian

S. Griffin. Euen while we thus stand wasting idle woordes

But to give greater rapidity and vigor to the dialog, Munday made the change. Similar examples occur at lines 100, 249, 303, 389, 454, 659, 730, 755, 983, 1014, 1189, 1232, 1391, 1440. One more

¹⁷ Captain Charles Johnson, *A General History of the Lives and Adventures of the most Famous Highwaymen, Murderers, Street-Robbers &c.* . . . London, 1734, pp. 15-18. Johnson says Denville came of an ancient and respectable family at Northallerton, North Riding of Yorkshire. It seems to me likely that he is a popular development or recreation of Joscelin Dayvill, who was a figure of some importance in the North Riding during the reign of Edward II, but lost his lands for rebellion. One of his chief opponents was the Earl of Pembroke. See the *Victoria County History, Yorkshire, North Riding*, I, 419, 424. All this adds to the complexity of the problem of the historical-legendary background of *John a Kent*, one of the most interesting aspects of the play, but one which is not yet clearly worked out.

¹⁸ W. W. Greg, in *Shakespeare's Hand in Sir Thomas More*. Cambridge, 1923, p. 56.

striking case occurs at lines 331-3. Line 332 may originally have been

Content ye Lordes, Ile tell ye on the way

rhyming with 331, or it may have been

Ile tell ye on the way, come let vs goe

rhyming with 333. Or it is conceivable that 333 is a late addition supplied, with the "come let vs goe" of the preceding line, to give John, Powesse, and Griffin a graceful exit.

The additional stage directions are scanty but indicative of at least an intention of staging the play. There is a command for John a Kent to enter after line 212, one line earlier than his entry has been provided for by Munday; there is a command for "Musique" at lines 776 and 916; at 1047 we have "Enter Iohn a Kent" anticipating Munday's direction "En[ter] Iohn a K[en]t listning" by two lines; another order for "Musique Chime" occurs at 1138, and finally there is an "Enter" (1436) as preparation for Cumber's angry return after he has been "nick nocked" instead of John a Kent. Of the actual performance of the play, however, we have no known record.

J. W. ASHTON

University of Iowa

THE HOE-HUNTINGTON FOLIO OF JONSON

Mr. H. L. Ford's useful *Collation of the Ben Jonson Folios 1616-31-1640* (Oxford: The University Press, 1932), based upon "the British Museum copies, others in provincial libraries, and some sixteen of Volume I and ten of Volume II" in his own possession, presents, on pages 14-15, from *Epicoene or The Silent Woman*, pages 531-540 of the 1616 folio, a number of readings that are said to occur only in G, which is the Grenville copy in the British Museum, and in part in A, which is Mr. Ford's own premier copy. I quote: "The (G) reading may be identified by the following:

- p. 531. No marginal note 'Horses o' the time' (G, A).
- p. 532. Last line of song 'They strike mine eyes' (G, A), all others 'Thy strike mine eyes.' Corrected in the 1640 and 1692. The page ends on 'painted and' (G, A).

- p. 533. ends on 'head made a most' (G).
 p. 534. 'going to his prize' (G), continued 1640 and 1692. All others 'marching.'
 p. 535. 'Do's hee *teach*, that would marry' (G). All others omit '*teach*.'
 p. 536. 'Sis Amorous' (G), instead of 'Sir Amorous.'
 p. 537. 'should keepe' (G, A). All others 'should but keepe.' The 1640, 1692 as (G, A).
 p. 538. 'We doe beare our coat' (G, A). All others, 'Wee doe beare *for* our coate.' The 1640, 1692 as (G, A).
 p. 539. ends on 'impudence?' with catch-word 'Tru.' (G).
 p. 540. 'puritan parleis' (G), continued 1640, 1692, instead of 'puritane preachings.'"

The Huntington Library has four of the 1616 Jonson folios. Of these, the Hoe-Huntington, Volume I, with accession number H. 62101, has all the distinctive readings cited above, except that on page 535 it omits 'teach.' On page 540 there is a difference in spelling, the Hoe-Huntington reading 'puritane parlee's' instead of 'puritan parleis.' Moreover, it is important to note that this copy incorporates the corrected readings. My collation of this folio with the textual variants recorded in *Ben Jonson*, edited by Herford and Simpson, Volume IV, shows that H. 62101 in all cases, except on page 415 of *Sejanus*, includes Jonson's corrections. It may be worth adding that this handsome volume, measuring 12 11/16 x 8 5/16 inches, nearly equals in size the Grenville copy, which measures 12 3/4 x 8 2/5, and which Mr. Ford designates as the "largest known" (p. 6).

GEORGE W. WHITING

The Rice Institute

REVIEWS

English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century. Edited by CARLETON BROWN. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932. Pp. xlv + 312.

This important and engaging book is the latest member of an impressive series which began with Professor Brown's *Register of Middle English Religious and Didactic Verse* (2 vols., 1916, 1920), and was continued in his *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century*

(1924). Those two works are now classics of English literary scholarship, and the new volume before us will easily achieve a similar assured position.¹

The general editorial plan of the new collection would have been abundantly satisfactory if it had merely conformed to that of its immediate predecessor in the series. As a matter of fact, however, the book now at hand not only maintains the editor's established standard of textual precision and rewarding commentary, but it also aids the reader through generous additional conveniences. We are given indices of persons and places, and of first lines; the glossary is more fully provided with cross-references; and the notes indicate more explicitly the poems which appear in print for the first time. For his patient attention to such helpful matters the editor deserves added praise.

In its content the new volume will seem agreeably familiar to most readers through the presence of such pieces as *Sumer is i-cumen in*, *Alysoun*, *Lenten is come with love to town*, *On hire is al mi lif ylong*, *Vbi sount qui ante nos fuerount*, and *De Clerico et Puella*. It is fair to say, indeed, that the collection is more striking through the presence of recognized favorites than through the addition of a large number of poems hitherto unprinted. It was not to be expected, indeed, that from the thirteenth century Professor Brown could contribute any such substantial and unified additions to the canon as appeared for the first time in his fourteenth-century volume: the lyrics collected by Bishop Sheppey, for example, or the group of a score or so of pieces from the commonplace book of John Grimestone.

Let it not be inferred, however, that the sheaf of poems newly brought to light from the thirteenth century is small or unimportant. At least thirteen now appear in print for the first time,² and a number of others, previously known after a fashion, are freshened or modified through the use of additional manuscripts. The one secular novelty is this entertaining skit (No. 21):

Say me, viit in þe brom,
Teche me wou i sule don
Pat min hosebonde
me louien wolde.

Hold þine tunke stille
& hawe al þine wille.

Of the new religious pieces, *A Light is Come to the World* (No. 24) and *Aspice, mittissime Conditor* (No. 33) are sufficiently representative. The first of these describes the Crucifixion in vivid detail of the kind shown in these lines:

¹ The series is to be continued by Professor Brown's edition of the English lyrics of the fifteenth century.

² The editor leaves me in doubt, momentarily, as to five or six others.

His bodi þat wes feir & gent
 & his neb suo scene
 Wes bi-spit & al to-rend,
 His rude wes worþen grene.

Hasse he biheuld þe rode,
 Þe modir þat was of miste
 & þer I-sei al ablode
 Hir sone þat her wes briste,
 Hisse tuo suete honden
 Wid nailles al to-ronden,
 Is fehīt īþurlīd bo,
 Is suete softe side
 I-þurlit depe & wyde—
 Wey, þat hire was wo!

In versifying a short Latin text ascribed to St. Bernard, the poem *Aspice, mitissime Conditor* achieves at least one line that clings to remembrance:

Mine lonke armes, stiue & sterke,
 Min heyin arrin dim & derke,
 Min þeyis honket so marbre-ston in werke.

The most remarkable aspect of Professor Brown's new volume, however, is not the novelty of its content, but the diligence and precision of his editing.³ Through fresh manuscripts brought into play, numerous poems long familiar in print now appear in clarified or enlarged versions; and through added erudition a number of pieces become for the first time fully intelligible. The kind of result obtained from the use of additional manuscripts is shown in *A Spring Song of Love to Jesus* (No. 63). To the text previously known from a single manuscript a second source adds not only numerous interesting variants, but also the following by no means negligible stanza:

Of iesu crist hi synge,
 Þat is so fayr and fre,
 swetest of alle þynge;
 hys opwe hic oȝe wel boe,
 wl fer he me soþte,
 myd hard he me boþte
 wyþ wnde to and þree,
 wel sore he was yswnge
 and for me myd spere istunge,
 ynayled to þe tree.

A particularly striking instance of a text made intelligible through erudite commentary is *An Antiphon of St. Thomas of Canterbury* (No. 42). As printed without elucidation in Morris's *Old English*

³ This precision very appropriately includes the recording of deletions indicated in the MSS by points, or dots. In recording such instances could brevity not be achieved through using the verb *expunge*? Thus *pointed for deletion* (p. 1) and *dotted for deletion* (p. 45) would become simply *expunged*.

Miscellany, this short piece could be regarded only as an unintelligible curiosity,—with its closing *Evovae* entered in the glossary without gloss! Through the diligence of the new editor,—and his collaborator,—we are now made aware of the legend of St. Thomas recounting the supernatural origin of this antiphon,—and we are given a gloss for *Evovae*.⁴

In welcoming Professor Brown's latest contribution the reviewer wishes to express, finally, his gratitude for its satisfying completeness. The book is no mere *anthology* of favorite pieces, or a selection from the several approved types, but an industrious *collection* of all the lyrics now recoverable from the great thirteenth century. Thus, for the first time, the reader is adequately equipped for comfortable enjoyment, for scholarly inquiry, and for comprehensive judgment.

KARL YOUNG

Yale University

Ballad Books and Ballad Men. By SIGURD BERNHARD HUSTVEDT.
Harvard University Press, 1930. \$4.00.

It is through no fault of the editors or of the reviewer that this notice of Professor Hustvedt's valuable study appears so long after the publication of the book. Perhaps the delay does not really matter, since, like its predecessor from the same pen, *Ballad Criticism in Scandinavia and Great Britain during the Eighteenth Century*, 1916, this work must eventually be read by everyone who wishes to inform himself about the collection and study of ballads. The present volume covers the nineteenth century, professing to do no more than to review the stages by which ballad-editing came to its flower at the hands of Grundtvig and Child. Incidentally, however, an introductory and a concluding chapter contain valuable suggestions as to the nature of ballads, their relationship to other forms, and the directions in which further studies should go.

Throughout the book, it seems to me, Mr. Hustvedt has preserved an admirably judicial tone, stating his judgments vigorously but with caution and good temper. The chapter on Scott is an instance in point. No better brief account of what Scott did and did not do as an editor could be asked. Equally good are the discussions of Scott's collaborators and immediate successors north of the Border, of Grundtvig's battle for the editorial method that he used so triumphantly, and of the steps by which Child developed his magnificent collection. In view of the close relationship between British

⁴ I should be inclined to modify slightly Professor Brown's explanation of *Evovae* as a "symbol in medieval music for the cadence with which the Gloria concludes." In the choir-books it is hardly a "symbol" of anything, but rather the last six vowels of the *Gloria Patri* serving as a support for the musical cadence written above them.

and Scandinavian ballads—though I think that that between the English and French has been too little stressed—and of the importance of Grundtvig's influence on Child, there is no incongruity in treating them in the same volume. It would be impossible, indeed, to tell the story adequately without bringing the two together. Not the least interesting part of the book is an appendix (pp. 241-304), which contains the letters that Child and Grundtvig wrote to one another between 1872 and 1883. Rightly read, they do honor to both men, for the one was as genuinely eager to help as the other was open to suggestion. How much Child owed to Grundtvig is amply shown by this correspondence and by the ballad index compiled by the latter, which is printed as another appendix (pp. 305-335).

It was probably inevitable that the chapters dealing with publications by Scots and Englishmen after Sir Walter's time should be relatively thin, although one is inclined to regret that Professor Hustvedt did not take the space to develop more at length some of the things he discusses. These chapters are too much like ordered notes, valuable in themselves but not wholly revealing the pattern that the author's studies have certainly enabled him to see. I think that he would have done better, too, to separate the matter of ballad imitation and ballad influence on the poets from the discussion of collecting and criticism. It is not adequately treated as it stands, and tends to confuse the reader. The case of Coleridge and Wordsworth (pp. 97-102) will serve as an example. I hope that Mr. Hustvedt will excuse me if I say that I believe he has not rightly understood the nature of their respective indebtedness to ballads. Yet it is far from my wish to end this notice with complaint. The book is well done, and was well worth doing.

GORDON HALL GEROULD

Princeton University

Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog, and the Inclosed Nations. By ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON. Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America, No. 5, Cambridge Mass., 1932. Pp. viii + 117.

In a paper published in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* LIX, pp. 130-163, Prof. Anderson attempted to determine the site of the legendary gate supposed to have been built by Alexander, and concluded that the earliest tradition placed it at the pass of Dariel in the Caucasus Mountains. In the book now under review he explains how the legend of the Gate became connected with the doctrine of Gog and Magog in Jewish and Chris-

tian eschatology. The syllogism¹ on p. 19, taken together with certain remarks on the identification of Gog and Magog with historical tribes (pp. 8-14), forms the key to the whole book. Various chapters deal with the Alexander legend in Mohammedan literature; the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel as inclosed behind the Gate and as associated or identified with Gog and Magog; the defense of the Gate; and the shifting of the site of the Gate, during the later Middle Ages, to remote regions in northern Europe and eastern Asia.

The book is well organized and contains a great abundance of passages quoted to support the statements of the author. My own extremely limited knowledge of the history of the Alexander legend makes it impossible for me to give a fair criticism of the author's use of sources, and indeed many of these sources are not accessible to me. But the book is principally a collection and examination of various traditions, and the amount of controversial matter is relatively slight. In general the author's views appear very reasonable.

The principal defect is that the book contains, unfortunately, more verbal errors than we should expect. On page 8, in the passage quoted from Josephus, *ἐπ' αὐτοῦ* is an error for *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*. On page 25, line 7, read *variously* for *various*; on page 28, in the middle of the quoted passage, read *thou* for *thous*; on page 44, line 16, *whether* begins a new sentence and should be capitalized. In the Bibliography under Gerland the page reference should read 330-373 instead of 330-272; and in the title of Paul Meyer's book, *Littérature Française* should stand in place of *Littérature*.

The passages quoted by the author are given in translation if the source is oriental (or Russian), but in the original if it is Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, or German. In a few cases Greek passages are translated, and the translations are thoroughly accurate.

JAMES W. POULTNEY

The Johns Hopkins University

Todd Memorial Volumes. Philological Studies. Edited by JOHN D. FITZGERALD and PAULINE TAYLOR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930. 2 vols. xiv + 226 + 264 pp. \$10.00.

Professor Todd "left behind him nearly seventy Doctors of Philosophy." This is one of a variety of tributes set down without

¹ The syllogism is as follows:

1. Alexander built the gate in the Caucasus to exclude the barbarians of the north, called by the general name Scythians.
2. As early as Josephus, (Gog and) Magog were identified with the Scythians and placed north of the Caucasus.
3. Therefore Alexander built the gate of the Caucasus to exclude Gog and Magog.

stint in thirty-four pages of Introduction. It is manifest, from a purely objective reading of the record, that here was a distinguished gentleman, active, wise, possessed of a fine pioneer spirit. There are vivid glimpses of the conditions of the profession in the United States a half-century ago, and a glance much further back is provided in quotations from an address before the MLA in 1889 by James Russell Lowell, who presently summed up progress in these words: "Remembering what I remember, it seems to me a wonderful thing that I should have lived to see a poem in Old French edited by a young American scholar . . . and printed in the Journal of this Society, a journal in every way creditable to the scholarship of the country." The young scholar was H. A. Todd. The Introduction gives a sense of the problems that faced early Romance scholars in this country, suggests the nature of the subsequent achievements, and, whatever the intention, causes one to reflect that the same energy and vigilance are needed now.

There are forty articles, on subjects exceedingly varied but all related somehow to modern languages. The editors speak of rejecting articles "too far afield," yet they were not inhospitable. To read both volumes from cover to cover suggests the experience (purely imaginary) of attending *all* the sessions of a given national assembly of the MLA.

For especially honorable mention one might pick out among the less highly technical articles: *La Doctrine Grammaticale et Poétique du "Gai Savoir"* (Joseph Anglade); *Lo Bello Stilo* (C. H. Grandgent); *Alexandre Hardy and Shakespeare* (H. C. Lancaster); *Ricciardetto e Fiordispina* (Pio Rajna). Other articles are provocative if not altogether convincing. I am tempted to suggest to Professor Kurz (*Manon Lescaut, a Study in Unchanging Critics*) that a not to be neglected exception to "the unindulgent unanimity of opinion about the conduct of Manon and Des Grieux" is Anatole France (*Le Génie Latin*, in *Œuvres Complètes*, xxi, 200). Professor Menut is surprised that Hugo should have named the Spanish Princess in *La Rose de l'Infante*, Marie, "since Philip II had no daughter of that name," and he continues: "This is a striking anachronism indeed, and can be explained only as the result of a strong inner urge within the recesses of the poet's mind." The discrepancy would not strike, or distress, any notable proportion of Hugo's readers, Hugo did not wait for special stimulus in order to try manipulating material, the process here is hardly recondite, and anyhow Philip II *did* have a daughter Marie (although the dates were not right for V. H.; cf. Levailant, *L'Œuvre de Victor Hugo*, p. 589, note 33). Professor Segall's ambition (*Sovereign and Vassal in Corneille's Plays*) to "link together the great dramatist's plays . . . into one logical, consistent whole," leads him into an unreal unity, and it is singularly inappropriate to speak of Corneille in terms of "velleities" (what

word is less Cornelian?). But until the millenium each reader of such studies will come upon points close to his own special interests that will seem to him debatable.

Any young American scholar in Romance would read these volumes through with profit. He would sense the ramifications of his subject, he would find some examples of what not to investigate and of how not to present material, he would also find evidence that scholarship can be graceful and that erudition need not exclude a sense of form; it might even be brought home to him that above all others a student of languages and literatures should not be insensitive to fine writing nor utterly unaffected by good models. He might remark that some of the best articles show a capacity for "vues d'ensemble" which the others lack, and if he also observed that the European contributors were especially successful here he might well accept this as a challenge.

HORATIO SMITH

Brown University

Notes Inédites de Sainte-Beuve. Avec une Introduction et Commentaire par CHARLY GUYOT. Recueil de Travaux publiés par la Faculté des Lettres, Université de Neuchâtel. 1931. 147 pp.

In the Collection Lovenjoul at Chantilly are two packages of manuscript notes by SB. The first is labelled *Vieilles Notes Utiles* and contains about 900 items; Professor Guyot now prints the full text of about 500 of these and lists the others, many of them merely quotations, with brief comment. The second package, which SB. had prudently marked *Vieilles Notes. Quelques-unes de bonnes*, is reserved for publication in *RHL*.

None of the notes here reproduced are dated, but G. cautiously and intelligently has established from the internal evidence reliable *points de repère*; we have before us the intimate reactions of SB. to his readings between twenty and twenty-five (1824 to 1829). In the case of a youth destined to such eminence the material is precious, and in some ways prophetic. There is significant confirmation of the influence of Bacon and of the Ideologists, and in particular support of Professor F. M. Warren's point about the importance to SB. of Cabanis (*Todd Memorial Volumes*, Columbia University, 1930, II, 252). Already SB. is distrustful of pure metaphysics and more and more committed to belles-lettres. Already, as he looks at certain characters of history, he discovers the feet of clay,—discovers them with relish in the opinion of G. "Il aime à . . . ramener ainsi à la commune humanité ces personnages que nous imaginons presque dégagés des contingences misérables." This is certainly the same SB. who will say at sixty: "J'écoute, et je ne suis pas ému"; whether here is merely a grudge against pedestals

(not altogether to leave the figure above) or a more pure perspicacity, this is not the moment to debate. There is anticipation of SB.'s caution about amalgamating nature and human nature (cf. the point he will later make about "une citadelle irréductible," NL, VIII, 88), and evidence of his faith, subsequently less strong, in perfectibility. As to SB. the man, G. thinks that the present evidence shows him sensual and having "une certaine sécheresse de cœur." On the first point the evidence, not to be reproduced here, is incontrovertible; as to the desiccation, G. seems harsh. He writes, ingeniously: "par une sorte de mimétisme génial, l'intelligence arrive chez lui à reproduire, à éprouver presque, les sentiments les plus délicats, mais sa propre vie sentimentale demeure pauvre, médiocre." This is a common charge against SB. and not to be denied simply because one esteems his intelligence, but, without urge to admire or detest, the recent account by Jean Bonnerot of *Un Rêve d'Amour en 1845: Sainte-Beuve et Ondine Valmore* (*Mercur de France*, 15 sept. 1932) points in a far different direction.¹

For the not highly specialized reader the 75 pages of actual text lack the piquancy and larger significance of SB.'s posthumous *Mes Poisons* (1926). Occasionally there is sharp comment such as (259): "Marivaux est un de ces écrivains auxquels il suffirait de retrancher pour ajouter ce qui leur manque." His refusal (118) to see any magic in Milton's "darkness visible" may seem unenlightened and not promising in a would-be poet. Much of the material is indispensable for those who come anywhere near to accepting Emile Henriot's tribute to SB. (in an article on the present volume, *Le Temps*, 29 février 1932): "toute la littérature est en lui, à l'état de somme."

HORATIO SMITH

Brown University

L'Expression figurée et symbolique dans l'Œuvre de Gustave Flaubert. By D. L. DEMOREST. Paris: Conard, 1931. Pp. xiii + 701.

This bulky octavo on Flaubert's metaphorical faculty and its utilisation might be called a cinematographic portrait of the great stylist who never wearied of repeating that style is the very flesh of thought, and its soul no less than its flesh.

Il y a en moi littérairement parlant deux bonshommes distincts, un qui est épris de gueulades, le lyrisme, de grands vols d'aigle, et toutes les sonorités de la phrase et des sommets de l'idée; un autre qui creuse et fouille le vrai tant qu'il peut, qui aime à accuser le petit fait aussi puissamment

¹ Cf. p. 541: "il est venu, toujours bon, fidèle, plein de dévouement, — celui que la légende s'obstine à vouloir montrer égoïste et mesquin, et qui au fond était un grand timide."

que le grand, qui voudrait vous faire sentir presque matériellement les choses qu'il produit,

wrote Flaubert in 1852. After proving the truth of this confession by Flaubert's letters, his works, and the testimony of his friends, Demorest traces the development of Flaubert's ideas on figurative language, as an introduction to his exhaustive chronological study of this aspect of the novelist. Then we follow the evolution of Flaubert's metaphors and metaphorical sense through the *Œuvres de Jeunesse*, the first *Education sentimentale*, *Par les champs et par les grèves*, the travel notes, the great novels and *contes*.

There are in all over 10,000 "images" in Flaubert; they increase in number and originality when the author is in love or enjoying his travel; they decline in his later works, as the superiority of the first version of the *Tentation* has long showed. But space fails us for a further summary, were it possible to summarize a book whose "Conclusion" takes 21,000 words. The volume ends with a series of numerical tables showing the proportion of various categories of metaphor as they occur in each work, from the first "Vision" upon Mount Athos to the dry and ironic pages of *Bouvard et Pécuchet*.

A valuable though too discursive study, which would be a monument to American scholarship if it had an index of metaphors noted by key-words. But why relate again the plots of the *Juvenilia*, or bring in needless biographers' disputes? Every Flaubertist knows, for instance, that it was not M. Gérard-Gailly but Professor Coleman who first proved that the Trouville episode must be dated 1836 (*Flaubert's Literary Development*, Baltimore, 1914, p. 2, n. 2).

L. PIAGET SHANKS

The Reception of English Literature in Germany. By LAWRENCE MARSDEN PRICE. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1932. 596 Seiten.

Was 1919 "nur" eine Bibliographie war, hat sich jetzt zu einem wirklichen und zwar ganz ausgezeichneten, grundlegenden Buch entwickelt. Man konnte freilich schon bei Erscheinen von Prices "Survey" 1920 die positive und ergebnisreiche Seite seiner Bibliographie ersehen; und wenn es so etwas wie eine schöpferische Bibliographie gibt, dann hat dieser überaus sorgfältige und gewissenhafte Forscher sie gewiss geschrieben. Aber seine neue Schrift ist doch mehr als ein blosses "work of reference"; es ist eine bis Dezember 1931 abschliessende wissenschaftlich zusammenfassende und kritische Studie über die Aufnahme der englischen Literatur in Deutschland. Jeder, der sich als Germanist oder Anglist mit diesem ganzen "Grenzgebiet" beschäftigt, muss Prices Werk einfach unentbehrlich finden.

Was das Buch neben der Sachlichkeit und Zuverlässigkeit noch auszeichnet, das sind sein Stil und seine Gesinnung. Ein Kunstwerk werde wohl nicht erwartet, sagt die Einführung bescheiden, aber alles, was Price schreibt, ist ebenso klar wie überzeugend, eben der Stil eines Mannes, der etwas zu sagen hat. Und weiter gilt mir als grosse Auszeichnung, dass das Buch keine "These" hat, dass es nichts "beweisen" will, als was sich aus den Tatsachen der Geschichte ergibt. Mit Recht wendet sich der Verfasser gegen das Verallgemeinern gerade auf dem Gebiet der zwischen England und Deutschland spielenden Beziehungen, Einflüsse und Gegeneinflüsse, und in diesem seinem freien Blick und seiner klugen Weitherzigkeit liegt mir auch die tiefste Berechtigung dazu, in der Widmung für Alexander Rudolf Hohlfeld das vorliegende Werk "ein Goethe-Buch im Goethe-Jahr" zu nennen. Mit Goethes Flagge sind zahllose Schriften erschienen, aber Goethes Unbefangenheit und vor allem sein Sinn für das Andersartige und zugleich Menschlich-allgemeine—man denke nur an die schönen Worte um Carlyles Schillerbuch—lassen sie in den meisten Fällen vermissen. Price gehört innerhalb der Grenzen seines Forschungsgebiets zu den seltenen Ausnahmen. Dabei möge hier ununtersucht bleiben, wie weit wir heute im Goetheschen Sinn "Weltliteratur" haben, oder ob die wahre Gegenseitigkeit der Beziehungen einfach schon im 19. Jahrhundert die einwandfreien "Einflüsse" des vorhergehenden Jahrhunderts abgelöst hat (vgl. Price, S. 361). Dass sich die Literatur der Goetheschen Hoffnung diametral entgegengesetzt entwickelt haben soll, ist wohl in J. G. Robertsons *Goethe and the Twentieth Century* (1912) zu lesen, aber heute nicht mehr aufrechtzuhalten. Price dürfte das nebenbei (bes. im 25. Kap.) nachgewiesen haben!

Prices Werk gliedert sich in 3 Hauptteile: Part One. The Eighteenth Century and Earlier. Part Two. Shakespeare in Germany. Part Three. The Nineteenth Century and Thereafter. Die nachfolgende Bibliographie hat an die 1200 Nummern, deren kritische Durcharbeitung allein schon eine Herkules-Arbeit darstellt. Eine detaillierte Kontrolle ist deshalb auch in einer einzigen Besprechung unmöglich. Aber wenn auch, was ich nach meinen zahlreichen Stichproben nicht glaube, viele Einzelfehler gefunden werden sollten, so würde das niemals der grossen, wahrhaft fruchtbaren, wissenschaftlichen Synthese als Leistung Abbruch tun. Prices ergebnisvolles Werk ist eben schlechthin einzigartig; denn eine ähnliche Beherrschung von zwei der wichtigsten Weltliteraturen findet sich so leicht nicht.

Einige Ergänzungen seien hier angefügt. Im Kapitel über Shaftesbury findet sich ein Ausdruck (S. 99), dass Fritz Jacobi Lessing "angeklagt" habe, ein Schüler Spinozas gewesen zu sein. Es heisst wörtlich: "and the dialog he published in evidence of the

fact, if authentic, would prove his assertion." Über dieses ganze Problem, d. h. über Lessings Spinozismus und Lessings Verhältnis zu Moses Mendelssohn, vgl. jetzt Hans Leisegang, *Lessings Weltanschauung*, Leipzig 1931, besonders S. 56 ff. und 159 ff.

Nachzutragen, z. B. nach Kürnberger und Ruppis (Price, S. 431 f.) ist noch ein sehr interessanter Roman von Reinhold Solger, nämlich *Anton in Amerika. Seitenstück zu Freitags 'Soll und Haben.'* Aus dem deutsch-amerikanischen Leben. In zwei Abteilungen. Bromberg 1862 (C. M. Roskowski). Eine freie Neubearbeitung dieses Romans von Erich Ebermayer erschien 1928 im J. M. Spaeth Verlag, Berlin. Zum Thema: Walt Whitman in Deutschland gehört unbedingt noch die zweibändige Übersetzungsauswahl von Hans Reisiger *Walt Whitmans Werk*, Berlin 1922. Die Interpretation Whitmans ist so bezeichnend kosmopolitisch, wie die Übersetzung gut ist.

Zuletzt möchte ich noch einige Anmerkungen zum 24. Kap. (The American Novel) machen. Zum grossen Teil ist der geringe Einfluss des amerikanischen Romans auf Deutschland (Price S. 426, 432 f.) durch eigene amerikanische Interesselosigkeit zu erklären. Die erste wissenschaftlich ernstzunehmende Geschichte des amerikanischen Romans ist bekanntlich erst vor einigen Jahren erschienen, und überhaupt ist das wissenschaftliche Interesse Amerikas für seine eigene Literatur noch recht jungen Ursprungs. Das hat ein Eindringen des höheren, des geistigen Amerikanertums in das deutsche Schrifttum so gut wie verhindert, wie es andererseits ein unbekümmertes Geniessen und Nachahmen des stofflichen Amerikanismus von Cooper bis Bret Harte nicht hat aufhalten können. Die Lücke zwischen unserm grossen Interesse für Mark Twain und der kritiklosen Begeisterung für den amerikanischen Nachkriegs-Roman wirklich zu erklären, z. B. zu erklären, warum Wm. Dean Howells und Winston Churchill völlig unbekannt geblieben sind, muss genauerer Untersuchung vorbehalten bleiben.

Der gröbere Amerikanismus hatte aber bis vor kurzem noch grosse Gelegenheiten bei uns, wie man an unserer Begeisterung für Jack London, Zane Grey oder—vorgestern noch—für Tarzan sehen konnte. Der ungeheure Erfolg von Upton Sinclair andererseits erklärte sich aus seinem Charakter als Propagandist und Exhibitionist. Seine internationalistische Botschaft klang den Ohren aller deutschen Salonradikalen, Sozialisten und Kommunisten, aber auch vieler deutschen Intellektuellen gleich süss, die sich aus irgend einem Grund vor der "Amerikanisierung" Europas fürchteten. In dieselbe Kerbe mit Upton Sinclair haften, wenn auch mit andersgeformten Äxten, Romanschriftsteller wie Sinclair Lewis, Dreiser, Sherwood Anderson. . . . Für Willa Cather besteht heute ein kleines Publikum; es wäre grösser, wenn sich die Verfasserin nicht durch *One of Ours* bei national empfindlichen Deutschen verdächtig gemacht

hätte. Dagegen wächst das Interesse für Edna Ferber, aber sie ist wie Hergesheimer oder Wilder auf bestimmte Kreise beschränkt, im grossen und ganzen die Gemeinde der Tauchnitz-Leser oder der sonst literarisch Amerika-Interessierten. Im allgemeinen aber wird heute das Erscheinen amerikanischer Literaturwerke nicht durch ihren Eigenwert bestimmt, sondern durch die Neigungen deutscher Verleger, die sich ihre Leute aus *Publisher's Weekly* heraussuchen, und die Anstrengungen der zahlreichen Literaturagenten. Ein wesentlicher Teil unserer amerikanischen Übersetzungsliteratur hat daher mit literarischen Interessen nicht viel zu schaffen, abgesehen davon, dass wir nur erstaunlich wenige geeignete Übersetzer haben.

Arpad Steiner, in seinem Artikel 'Sinclair Lewis in Germany,' *Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies*, Northwestern University Publication 1930, S. 140, zitiert auch ein Wort von mir über die deutsche Babbitt-Übersetzung mit dem Zusatz: "German reviewers do not appear to have paid much attention to the value of the translations." Aber was konnte ein einzelner Kritiker gegenüber dem ganzen beklagenswerten "Übersetzungsbetrieb" von heute überhaupt tun? Als Vertreter der Amerikanischen Literaturgeschichte muss ich mich über jedes deutsche Interesse am amerikanischen Buch freuen und werde ich mich daher in einer Besprechung der Verdeutschung am besten mit dem Urteil lesbar oder nicht begnügen. Eine sprachlich-literarische Untersuchung über den Übersetzungsstil und besonders die Übersetzungstreue, etwa in der Art von Arpad Steiners verdienstlicher Arbeit, ist dabei wenigstens in Zeitschriften wie der *Literatur* gar nicht angebracht. Ausserdem ist eine nachträgliche Beanstandung einer Übersetzung praktisch zwecklos; denn der Verkauf richtet sich nicht nach solchem "Wert," sondern nach anderen Gesetzen. Ich habe deshalb gelegentlich den umgekehrten Weg versucht, nämlich durch die amerikanischen Autoren auf ihre deutschen Verleger einzuwirken, aber völlig vergeblich. Diese literarische Angelegenheit hat natürlich auch eine finanzielle Seite.

Selbst Price gegenüber muss ich mich noch meiner Haut wehren, wenn er nämlich meinen allerersten vergleichenden Aufsatz über "Deutsche und amerikanische Romane" in dem alten *Germanistic Society Quarterly* (New York, 1916) gar zu endgültig auffasst (Price, S. 433 f.). Ich habe tatsächlich seitdem viel dazu gelernt und meine, in der Erkenntnis des Amerikanischen im Roman ein gut Stück weitergekommen zu sein. Eine Art Alibi hoffe ich mit meinem zweibändigen Werk: *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (I. Von Kolonie zum Weltreich, II. Die amerikanische Demokratie von heute), Stuttgart 1932 erschienen, geliefert zu haben. Aber trotzdem natürlich: Be merciful to me, a fool!

Goethe, Leben und Werk. Von PHILIPP WITKOP. Stuttgart und Berlin: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1931. x, 496 pp. (9.- RM.)

Witkops Werk ist die einzige Biographie größeren Stiles geblieben, die uns das Goethejahr beschert hat (wenn wir das Ende des Vorjahres mit in dieses einbeziehen dürfen). Drei Jahre zuvor hatte Walther Linden mit feinem Takt und künstlerischer Einsicht das zweibändige Werk Bielschowskys erneuert, das im Jahre 1896 mit dem ersten Bande begonnen und erst nach des Verfassers Tode (1902) von anderer Hand zu Ende geführt worden war. Gab uns Bielschowsky die ausführliche Darstellung des Goethischen Lebens und Wirkens, suchte Chamberlain das Gesetz seiner Entwicklung zu erfassen und besonders Goethe als Naturforscher tiefer zu würdigen, Simmel dagegen den Geistigen Kern des Denkers herauszustellen, das Urphänomen Goethe, sozusagen, so beschränkte sich Gundolf mit großem und eigenwilligen Wurf auf das Werk (1916), wie es den einzigen und gewaltigen Bildner spiegelt. Ludwigs Verdienst bestand darin (1920), stärker auf die dämonischen und tragischen Spannungen des problematischen Menschen Goethe hinzuweisen. Von Bielschowsky, Ludwig und Gundolf, deren Biographien bis zu tausend Seiten und mehr umfassen, unterscheidet sich das Witkopsche Werk durch eine für den amerikanischen Leser nicht zu unterschätzende Knappheit und Prägnanz, die zugleich die Weitschweifigkeit der beiden ersteren und die z. T. unüberwindliche Schwierigkeit des letzteren vermeidet, ohne dabei an Fülle und Tiefe zu verlieren.

Freilich bietet er in seiner Problemstellung nichts eigentlich Neues, erfreut indessen durch hohe künstlerische Vollendung der Darstellung, überrascht durch manche eigene Formulierung und vertieft durch glückliche Deutung in neugewählten Citaten. Klare Gegenüberstellungen wie die Behrisch's im ersten und Langers wie im zweiten Kapitel kontrastieren die Leipziger und Frankfurter Entwicklung. Sehr lebendig wird die Straßburger Entfaltung durch Nebeneinanderstellung Hamans, Lessings und Herders, dessen Einfluß auf die Lyrik des jungen Liebenden an Beispielen erhellt wird. Nietzsches Ausspruch: "Trachte ich denn nach meinem Glücke? Ich trachte nach meinem Werke" beleuchtet blitzartig das Dilemma der tragischen Flucht aus der Straßburger Liebe.

Ein Hegelzitat ("Zärtlichkeit des Gemüts, welches weiß, daß im Bestimmten es sich mit der Endlichkeit einläßt, sich eine Schranke setzt und die Unendlichkeit aufgibt: es will aber nicht der Totalität entsagen, die es beabsichtigt" p. 102) klärt das Wertherproblem, vor dem noch R. M. Meyer ratlos stand und das selbst bei Gundolf im Gedanklichen stecken bleibt. Glänzend ist die Schilderung des Besuches in Pempelfort und bedeutend der endliche Durchbruch zur dämonischen Lebensgewißheit der Egmontstimmung gegeben.

Auf kürzestem Raume doch höchst gegenständlich wird die Weimarer Umgebung dargestellt mit ihrer Entwicklung Goethes zu Einschränkung, Bodenständigkeit und innerer Ausweitung; auch das Glück dieser Epoche wird nicht unterschätzt (166), wie andererseits Witkop dem Wesen Christianes ohne Uebertreibung gerecht wird, während noch Hefe in seinem Faust den Gewinn dieser Liebe gänzlich verneint. Am schönsten zeigt das Kapitel *Trilogie der Leidenschaft* die Kompositionskunst Witkops, die hier mit dem Tode Christianes einsetzt, die Vereinsamung Goethes an der Hundekomödie und dem Zerwürfnis mit dem Herzog aufzeigt, dann über die politischen Wirren zu Goethes Byronerlebnis fortschreitet, um nunmehr den Gipfelpunkt in der Tragik der Marienbader Liebe und Elegie zu erreichen. Trost der Musik (Mme Szymanowska) führt zu Zelter und zum Prolog der *Trilogie*, und als Epilog stehen die Worte über Byron: "Es ist eben ein Unglück, daß so ideenreiche Geister ihr Ideal durchaus verwirklichen, ins Leben einführen wollen. Das geht nun einmal nicht, das Ideal und die gemeine Wirklichkeit müssen streng geschieden bleiben."

Die folgenden beiden Kapitel umfassen die *Wanderjahre* und den *Faust*, das letzte den ergreifenden Ausklang. Eine knappe Bibliographie und ein ausreichendes Register schließen sich an.

Witkops Werk ist kein populäres Buch. Eine Kenntnis der Hauptwerke Goethes ist erforderlich zu seinem Verständnis, eine Fähigkeit intelligenten Mitarbeitens unerläß zu seiner Würdigung. Aber auch der Goetheforscher wird es dankbar für Anregung, Klärung und Vertiefung aus der Hand legen.

ERNST FEISE

Johan ûz dem Virgiere. Eine spätmhd. Ritterdichtung nach flämischer Quelle nebst dem Facsimileabdruck des flämischen Volksbuchs Joncker Jan wt den Vergiere. Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Dr. ROBERT PRIEBSCHE. Heidelberg: Winter, 1931. Pp. vii + 144 (incl. pp. 65-144 text). Facsimile of the Volksbuch pp. 29 (Modern numbering).

The sole manuscript, once the property of the Bibliotheca Philippica at Cheltenham, was copied by the editor in 1894. It is now the property of the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin and was not accessible to the editor for a revision in England. The Introduction treats in chapter I the 'Stoffgeschichte', offering in parallel columns a synopsis of *Richars li Biaus* and the related *Johan*, which however has claims to be regarded as an independent work. The author of the German text states explicitly that his work is a translation from the Flemish. The editor then treats of the *Volksbuch*, a print of about 1590, and attempts to reconstruct from this and the *Johan* the general character of the Flemish original, which is

by an unknown author. It is preserved perfectly neither by the *Volksbuch* nor the *Johan*. The dependance of the Flemish original on the older redaction of the *Richars li Biaus* is further touched upon, likewise possible Flemish influences. The summary judgment of the editor is that the original work was a biographical *Roman* of an ideal knight, the narrative possessing a distinct touch of realism. The German adapter is assumed to have been a *Fahrender*, a wandering reciter, of no high order but avoiding the lowest depths of a mechanical translation.

In chapter II, after a few words on the manuscript, the editor offers a treatment of the language and orthography with the customary emphasis on the forms of the translator as established by the rhymes. He thus determines as home of the poet a West Middle German section, preferably one enclosed by the line Oppenheim, Alzey, Worms, three towns of Rheinhessen, in which section the scribe would also be located. The time suggested for the poem is the 14th century; the manuscript is dated about 1450. The editor has not hesitated to normalize the manuscript on these assumptions, although with some misgivings as to his proceeding. This seems to the reviewer a regrettable decision where only one manuscript is preserved. It very much hampers the student of language and orthography, who must constantly have an eye on the notes for the editor's emendations. The reviewer cannot conceal his conviction that sound tests frequently seem to show that the forms of the original have been arbitrarily changed in favor of preconceived ideas of correctness. A number of remarks on syntax, style and metrics follow, where the latter is established as belonging to the loose practice of the epigones like Ulrich von Eschenbach. Two pages at the end are devoted to the *Volksbuch*.

The reviewer is impressed by the unflagging interest and general competence with which the editor has followed up all phases of his subject. In publishing a MHG manuscript he has also enriched Flemish literature with an otherwise lost work.

FREDERICK H. WILKENS

New York University

The Goethe Centenary at the University of Wisconsin. A Memorial Volume of Addresses and Some Other Contributions. Edited by A. R. HOHLFELD. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature No. 34.) Published by the University. Madison, 1932. 120 pp.

This collection mirrors one of the most impressive celebrations of the Goethe Centenary, the factual details of which are reported in B. Q. Morgan's prefatory account. A stately poem by William Ellery Leonard, *Greetings from the State* by Governor Philip La

Follette and a *Salutation to the Goethe Spirit* by President Glen Frank open the symposium of addresses, among which the German Ambassador Friedrich von Prittwitz und Gaffron in his lucid and precise manner outlines the leadership of Goethe and other German thinkers toward the goal of an international mind.

Camillo von Klenze in his address *America and Goethe* traces the development of the poet through Rationalism and Emotionalism to the idea of service in practical activity. This service is inspired by an optimistic outlook upon the world, but it rises above the narrowly practical on one hand, the barrenly esthetic on the other to a realization of the fact that imperfection is productive. This spirit is necessary for the America of today. With undiminished fervor Eugen Kühnemann plunges into the problem of *Goethe and the Modern World*. Since to him Goethe represents the highest type of man from antiquity to our times, his address contains an epitome of Goethe and the development of humanity in general. Eyes closed he draws the stops of his powerful organola and plays all keys at once. With remarkable clearness and discernment George Wagner reviews the achievements and failures of *Goethe as a Scientist* and succeeds in enlightening scholar and layman without indulging in vague generalities, a danger that has not always been avoided in similar attempts. Philo M. Buck, Jr. compares *Goethe and Shelley* and, clarifying their attitude toward evolution sheds new light on the problem as a whole as well as upon individual parts of their two works, *Prometheus Unbound* and *Faust*.

True egoism and true altruism as found in Goethe's whole life and development are the polar opposites from which A. R. Hohlfeld develops *The Meaning of Goethe for the Present Age*. Our individualism in social and economic life, our intolerance of individuality in the sphere of thought and culture need a complete reversal, and Goethe's formula "polarity and ascending growth" would seem to furnish the medicine for our sick age, for "only where there are rich, free, and creative personalities can there be a rich, free, and creative life of the spirit."

This strong and vibrant address, closing a rich and dignified celebration of the greatest genius Germany has produced, is in retrospect overcast with a tragic hue. For if one of the great messages of the Goethe year was—as Hohlfeld expresses it—"his valiant insistence on the truth and kindness and honest exertion as the essentials in the relations of men with each other in their social and economic life, and last not least his gospel of understanding and cooperation among nations the world over," his message threatens to be drowned out now in a "hostile atmosphere of so much selfishness and dishonesty, intolerance and violence, vulgarity and hypocrisy, selfcomplacency and irreverence."

ERNST FEISE

L

D
Y
+

A
M
D
(
S

M
V
(

R

R
b
R
R
l

a
C
C
v
C

V
C
R

t
R
A
R

S
V

S
V

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Kurtz, Benjamin P.—The Pursuit of Death: A Study of Shelley's Poetry. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933. Pp. xxii + 339. \$3.50.

Macgregor, Margaret Eliot.—Amelia Alderson Opie: Worldling and Friend. *Northampton (Mass.)*: Modern Language Departments, 1933. Pp. xvi + 146. \$0.75. (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, XIV.)

Matthes, Heinrich Christoph.—Die Einheitlichkeit des Ormmulum. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1933. Pp. xvi + 278. M. 17.50. (Germanische Bibliothek.)

Moll, Ernest G.—The Appreciation of Poetry. *New York*: Crofts, 1933. Pp. xviii + 266. \$1.50.

Olmes, Antonie.—Sprache und Stil der Englischen Mystik des Mittelalters unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Richard Rolle von Hampole. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. Pp. vii + 100. M. 4.50. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, v. LXXVI.)

Patterson, Frank Allen (ed.)—The Student's Milton. Revised edition. *New York*: Crofts, 1933. Pp. liv + 1170 + 120. \$5.00. (Complete poems and greater part of prose works, with trans. of Italian, Latin, and Greek poems.)

Pope, Alexander.—Pope: Poetry and Prose, with Essays by Johnson, Coleridge, Hazlitt, &c.; Introduction and Notes by H. V. Dyson. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1933. Pp. xviii + 188. \$1.25.

Schütte, Gudmund.—Our Forefathers, the Gothonic Nations: A Manual of the Ethnography of the Gothic, German, Dutch, Anglo-Saxon, Frisian and Scandinavian Peoples. Vol. II. *Cambridge*: Univ. Press, 1933. Pp. xvi + 482 + 24. \$9.50.

Sisam, Kenneth.—Cynewulf and his Poetry. *London*: Humphrey Milford, 1933. Pp. 32. \$0.80. (Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture, from Proceedings of British Academy, VIII.)

Susebach, Heinz.—Caxton: Tulle of Olde Age; Textuntersuchungen mit literarischer Einführung. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. Pp. xxii + 118. M. 5. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, v. LXXV.)

GERMAN

Ammon, Hermann.—Deutsche Literaturgeschichte in Frage und Antwort. Teil 2: Von Luther bis zur Gegenwart. 3., neubearb.

Aufl. mit Bücherkunde. *Berlin*: Dümmler, 1933. 248 pp. M. 4.

Bauer, Michael.—Christian Morgensterns Leben und Werk. Vollendet von Margarete Morgenstern u. Rud. Meyer. Mit Beiträgen von Michael Bauer. *München*: Piper (1933). 393 pp. M. 5.60.

Bolte, Johannes.—Unbekannte Schauspiele des 16. u. 17. Jhs. [Aus: Sitzungsberichte d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1933, 10]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1933. 37 pp. 4°. M. 2.50.

Carow, Gretel.—Zacharias Werner und das Theater seiner Zeit. [Theater und Drama. Bd. 3]. *Berlin*: Elsner Verlagsges. [1933]. 136 pp. M. 4.

Castle, Eduard.—Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung in Österreich-Ungarn. Unter Mitwirkung hervorragender Fachgenossen nach dem Tode von J. W. Nagl u. J. Zeidler hrsg. Dritter (Schluss-) Band 1848-1918. 10 Abt. *Wien*: Carl Fromme, 1933. Pp. 1433-1592.

Dichtung und Forschung. Festschrift für Emil Ermatinger. Zum 21. Mai 1933. Hrsg. von Walter Muschg und Rud. Hunziker. *Frauenfeld u. Leipzig*: Huber [1933]. xii, 297 pp. M. 16.

Eggeling, H. F.—Modern German Short Stories. Second Series. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933. vii, 274 pp. \$1.15.

—Advanced German Prose Composition for use in Colleges and Universities. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933. xv, 212 pp. \$1.15.

Feist, S.—Die deutsche Sprache. Kurzer Abriss der Geschichte unserer Muttersprache von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Gegenwart. 2. vollkommen neubearb. u. erw. Aufl. *München*: Max Hueber, 1933. viii, 375 pp., 7 plates. M. 7.20.

Fuchs, Clara-Charlotte.—Dante in der deutschen Romantik. [S.-A. aus Jahrbuch d. Deutschen Dante-Ges. 15. 1933]. *Weimar*: Böhlau, 1933. Pp. 61-134.

Goldstein, Walter.—Jakob Wassermann, der Mann von sechzig Jahren. *Leipzig*: Volekmar, 1933. 37 pp. M. 1.50.

Gottschalk, Walther.—Untersuchungen zu Ferdinand Krügers Romanen. Diss. Greifswald 1930. *Halle*: Hallische Nachrichten, 1933. iv, 96 pp.

Harms, Susanne.—Clemens Brentano und die Landschaft der Romantik. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Beziehungen zur romantischen Malerei. Diss. *Würzburg*: Becker, 1932. 47 pp.

Harnapp, Egon.—Masse und Persönlichkeit im Drama. Diss. *München*. *Chemnitz*: Buchner, 1933. 87 pp.

Haxel, Heinr.—Studien zu den Lustspielen Christian Weises (1642-1708). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Schuldramas. Diss. Greifswald. *Stettin*: Ostee- Druck und -Verlag, 1932. xiii, 100 pp. M. 4.

Hecht, Hans.—T. Percy, R. Wood und J. D. Michaelis. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der Genieperiode [Göttinger Forschungen. H. 3]. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer, 1933. 94 pp. M. 7.50.

Hecker, Konrad.—Mensch und Masse. Situation und Handeln der Epigonen, gezeigt an Immermann und den Jungdeutschen [Das politische Volk. H. 2]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1933. 128 pp. M. 6.

Heliand und Genesis. Hrsg. von Otto Beahghel. 4. Aufl. Der Heliandausg. 5. Aufl. [Altdeutsche Textbibl. Nr. 4]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1933. xxxvi, 289 pp. M. 4.50.

Heuschele, Otto.—Schiller und die Jugend dieser Zeit. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer, 1933. 39 pp. M. 1.

Hoffmann, Otto, u. Kobelt, Helmut.—Sagen aus dem Bartschlande. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1933. 91 pp. 95 Pf.

Howald, Ernst.—Gottfried Keller. Schweizer, Deutscher Dichter, Weltbürger. Eine hist.-biogr. Betrachtung. Den Schweizern und Deutschen in Amerika gewidmet. *New York*: Stechert, 1933. xiii, 111 pp. M. 5.

Howe, George M.—Fundamentals of German. *Boston*: Ginn & Co. [1933]. viii, 232 pp. \$1.60.

Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft. Hrsg. von Karl Glossy. Jg. 32 [1933]. *Wien*: Perles [1933]. 153 pp. M. 3.60.

Jansen, Heinz.—Aus dem Göttinger Hainbund. Overbeck und Sprickmann. Ungedruckte Briefe Overbecks. Mit einer Silhouette Overbecks. *Münster*: Regensbergische Verlbh. 1933. xi, 214 pp. M. 5.50.

Keipert, Hans.—Die Wandlung Goethescher Gedichte zum klassischen Stil. Die Umarbeitungen für die Gesamtausgabe 1789. [Jenaer germanistische Forschungen. 21]. *Jena*: Frommann, 1933. viii, 165 pp. M. 9.

Kienle, Mathilde von.—Der Schicksalsbegriff im Altdeutschen. Diss. [S.-A. aus Wörter und Sachen. Bd. 15]. *Heidelberg*: Winter [1933]. Pp. 81-111.

Koch, Willi.—Stefan George. Weltbild, Naturbild, Menschenbild. *Halle*: Niemeyer [1933]. vi, 114 pp. M. 3.80.

Kohmann, Hans.—Die neuhochdeutsche Wortstellung. Ein Hauptkapitel sprachlicher Ausdrucksbildung. *Ostervieck*: Zickfeldt, 1933. 31 pp. 50 Pf.

Koischwitz, Otto.—Bilderlesebuch. *New York*: F. S. Crofts, 1933. 132 pp.

Krause, Joachim.—Fontane und der Dia-

lekt. Diss. Greifswald. *Kirchhain N.-L.*: Schmiersow, 1932. 85 pp.

Kuhberg, Werner.—Verschollenes Sprachgut und seine Wiederbelebung in neuhochdeutscher Zeit. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Wortforschung [Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur germ. u. roman. Philologie. H. 4]. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1933. 66 pp. M. 2.

Lawnik, Lore.—Franz Herwig. Nach persönlichen Erinnerungen, Briefen und seinen Werken. *München*: Kösel & Pustet [1933]. 63 pp. M. 1.60.

Lieske, Rudolf.—Tiecks Abwendung von der Romantik. Diss. [Germanische Studien. H. 134]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 150 pp. M. 6.

Limpert, Wilh.—Auf Goethes Spuren im Kreis Langensalza und Umgebung. Im Auftr. des Stadtverkehrsamtes Langensalza hrsg. *Langensalza*: A. Thomas, 1932. 70 pp. M. 1.

Linden, Walther.—Aufgaben einer nationalen Literaturwissenschaft. *München*: C. H. Beck, 1933. 65 pp. M. 2.40.

Luther, Bernhard.—Heinrich v. Kleist, Kant und Wieland. Hrsg. vom Wieland-Museum. *Biberach*: Dorn, 1933. 76 pp. M. 1.50.

Luther, Martin. Ausgewählt und mit Einleitung und Anm. versehen von Dr. Gustav Bebermeyer. [Deutsche Literaturdenkmäler des 16. Jhs. 1. = Sammlung Göschen, 7]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1933. 128 pp. M. 1.62.

Magenau, Rud. Friedr. Heinr., Chr. Ludw. Neuffer, Joh. Chr. Friedr. Hölderlin.—Das Bundesbuch der Freunde Hölderlins. Nach der Original-Hs. in der Württ. Landesbibl. zu Stuttgart. [Wien: Reichner, 1933]. 12 pp. M. 1.50.

Mann, Thomas.—Goethes Laufbahn als Schriftsteller. (Vortrag, gehalten in Weimar, 21. März, 1932) [Schriften der Corona. 5]. *München*: Oldenbourg [1933]. 36 pp. M. 1.50.

Nicolay, Wilhelm.—Goethe und das katholische Frankfurt. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Beck, 1933. 83 pp. 60 Pf.

Nied, Edmund.—Fränkische Familiennamen, urkundlich ges. u. sprachlich gedeutet. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1933. 168 pp. M. 4.50.

Olbrich, Rosa.—Die deutsch-dänische Dichterin Friederike Brun, ein Beitrag zur empfindsam-klassizistischen Stilperiode. Diss. *Breslau*. *Wanne-Eickel*: Wolf, 1932. vi, 147 pp.

Petersen, Julius, u. Trunz, Erich.—Lyrische Weltichtung in deutschen Übertragungen aus sieben Jahrhunderten, ausgewählt [Literarhistorische Bibliothek. Bd. 9]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1933. ix, 192 pp. M. 4.80.

Pinder, Wilhelm.—Goethe und die bildende Kunst. Festrede . . . 11. Mai, 1932. *München*: C. H. Beck in Komm., 1933. 23 pp. 4°. M. 3.

Pobé, Marcel.—Rainer Maria Rilke. Wandel in seiner Geisteshaltung [Freiburger Forschungen zur Kunst- und Literaturgeschichte. 1]. *Berlin*: Hendrick, 1933. 92 pp. M. 3.50.

Psalmverdeutschung, Die, von den ersten Anfängen bis Luther. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte. Mit tabellarischen Übersichten. Zweite Hälfte mit acht Bildtafeln hrsg. in Gemeinschaft mit Fritz Jülicher und Willy Lüdtke von Hans Vollmer. *Potsdam*: Akademische Verlagsges. Athenaion, 1933. vi, 288 pp., 8 plates.

Quadfasel, Hanna.—Theodor Mundts literarische Kritik und die Prinzipien seiner "Ästhetik." Diss. Heidelberg. *Bruchsal i. B.*: Kruse, 1932. x, 135 pp.

Radau, Benno.—Der deutsche Adelsroman in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jhs. Diss. *Freiburg i. B.*: 1930. iv, 263 pp., typewritten.

Rilke, Rainer Maria.—Briefe aus den Jahren 1907 bis 1914. Hrsg. von Ruth Sieber-Rilke u. Carl Sieber. *Leipzig*: Insel-Verl., 1933. 392 pp. M. 7.

Roffler, Thomas.—Bildnisse aus der neueren deutschen Literatur. *Frauenfeld u. Leipzig*: Huber [1933]. 267 pp. M. 7.20.

Schaufal, Richard. Karl Kraus. Versuch eines geistigen Bildnisses. (Geleitwort von Otto Forst-Battaglia). [Zeitgenossen = Kleine hist. Monographien. Nr. 39]. *Wien*: Reinhold, 1933. 84 pp. M. 2.

Schönfeld, Margarete.—Gutzkows Frauengestalten. Ein Kapitel aus der literarhistorischen Anthropologie des 19. Jh. [Germanische Studien. H. 133]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 120 pp. M. 4.80.

Schrader, Hans.—Hölderlins Deutung des "Oedipus" und der "Antigone." Die Anmerkungen im Rahmen der klassischen und romantischen Deutungen des Antik-Tragischen. Diss. [Mnemosyne. H. 10]. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1933. viii, 88 pp. M. 3.75.

Schukart, Hanna.—Gestaltungen des Frauen-Bildes in deutscher Lyrik. Diss. [Mnemosyne. H. 11]. *Bonn*: Röhrscheid, 1933. 84 pp. M. 3.50.

Schumacher, Joachim.—Johann Wilhelm Simler. Die Rezeption der Opitz-Barock in der deutschen Schweiz. Diss. Heidelberg. *Wertheim a. M.*: Bechstein, 1933. 72 pp.

Sommer, Kurt A.—Das Bild der Antike bei Hölderlin. Diss. Münster. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1933. viii, 83 pp. M. 2.

Sommerfeld, Martin.—Judith-Dramen des 16./17. Jahrhunderts. Nebst Luthers Vorrede zum Buch Judith. [Literarhistorische Bibliothek. Bd. 8]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünnhaupt, 1933. 196 pp. M. 5.50.

—Das Strassburger Akademietheater und die Wende von der Renaissance zum Barock [Sonderdruck aus: *Elsass-Lothringisches Jahrbuch*, 12. Bd.]. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Selbstverlag des Elsass-Lothringen-Instituts, 1933. Pp. 109-134.

Stammler, Wolfgang.—Prosa der deutschen Gotik. Eine Stilgeschichte in Texten. Ausgewählt und geordnet. [Literarhistorische Bibliothek. Br. 7]. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünnhaupt, 1933. 148 pp. M. 4.80.

Stemplinger, Eduard.—Von der Äolsharfe bis zur Xantippe. Ein kleines Handbuch antiker Redensarten im deutschen Sprachgebrauch. *München*: Heimeran, 1933. 149 pp. M. 2.

Stürmer, Franz.—Das Griechische in der deutschen Sprache und Bildung [Sammlung Neudeutscher Humanismus. 5]. *Breslau*: Franke; Borgmeyer, 1932. 73 pp. M. 1.

Weller, Alfred.—Fürst Pücklers Lebens- und Landschaftstil. *Cottbus*: Heine, 1933. 29 pp. M. 1.90.

Wichmann, K.—Kleines Taschenwörterbuch der deutschen und englischen Sprache. Miniature Dictionary of the German and English Languages. *New York*: E. P. Dutton & Co. [1933]. 526 pp 12". \$0.80.

Wielsands Gesammelte Schriften. Hrsg. von der Deutschen Kommission der Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Erste Abteilung: Werke, Elfter Band. Berichte der Herausgeber zum ersten bis zehnten Band, 1. Heft: Bericht und Register zum neunten Band Der goldne Spiegel, Singspiele und kleine Dichtungen 1772-1775 von Wilhelm Kurrelmeyer. *Berlin*: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1932. 114 pp. M. 5.60.

Wohlrahe, W.—Die Freiheitskriege. 1. Bd. In Lied und Geschichte. 2. Bd. Im Spiegel der Roman- u. Dramenliteratur. *Leipzig*: Dürr'sche Buchh. [1933]. 327, 328 pp., each vol. M. 3.

Zaehle, Barbara.—Knigges Umgang mit Menschen und seine Vorläufer. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Gesellschaftsethik. [Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgesch. H. 22]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1933. viii, 239 pp. M. 9.

Zausmer, Otto.—Grillparzers Lyrik als Ausdruck seines Wesens. Mit Förderung der Grillparzer-Ges. gedruckt. *Wien, Leipzig*: Deutscher Verlag f. Jugend und Volk [1933]. 168 pp. M. 3.50.

Ziemendorff, Ingeborg.—Die Metapher bei den weltlichen Lyrikern des deutschen Barock. Diss. [Germanische Studien. H. 135]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1933. 142 pp. M. 5.60.

FRENCH

Albalat, A.—G. Flaubert et ses amis. *Paris*: Œuvre repr., 1933. 256 pp. Fr. 6.

Alembert, d'.—Discours prélim, de l'Encyclopédie, éd. A.-V. Pierre. *Paris*: Hatier, 1932. 80 pp.

Allard, L.—La Comédie de Mœurs en Fr. au XIX^e s. T. II. 1815-30. *Paris*: Hachette, 1933. Fr. 12.

Antoine.—Le Théâtre. *Paris*: Eds. de France, 1932. 516 pp. Fr. 25.

Balzac.—Le Catéchisme social, précédé de l'article "Du Gouvernement moderne, éd. B. Guyon. *Paris*: Renaissance du Livre, 1933. 222 pp.

———. *La Peau de chagrin*, éd. M. Allem. *Paris*: Garnier, 1933. xxx + 463 pp. Fr. 9.

Baldensperger, F.—Alfred de Vigny. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1933. Fr. 12. (Etudes fr.)

Batiffol, L.—La Vie de Paris sous Louis XIII. *Paris*: Calmann-Lévy, 1932. 255 pp.

Berlet, C.—Stanislas de Guailà, Mage et poète (1861-97). *Paris*: Berger-Levrault, 1933. 18 pp. Fr. 6.

Bisson, L. A.—Le Romantisme litt. au Canada fr. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 285 pp. Fr. 36.

Blinkenberg, A.—L'Ordre des mots en fr. mod. II. *Copenhagen*: Levin and Munksgaard, 1933. 241 pp.

Bocquet, L.—Autour d'Albert Samain. *Paris*: Mercure de Fr., 1933. 244 pp. Fr. 12.

Bor, Marie.—Balzac contre Balzac. *Paris*: l'Eglantine, 1933. 80 pp.

Bruyère, J.—Hist. litt. des gens de métier en Fr. *Paris*: Jouve, 1932. 264 pp. Fr. 15.

Carvalho, R. de.—Rabelais et le rire de la Renaissance. *Paris*: Hazan, 1932. 256 pp. Fr. 3.50.

Cazes, A.—Grimm et les encyclopédistes. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1933. 408 pp. Fr. 40.

Chacornac, C.—Aliscans, chanson de geste du 13^e s. *Paris*: Lanore, 1933. 256 pp. Fr. 12.

Chenevière, J.—La Comtesse de Ségur. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1932. 223 pp. Fr. 15.

Clavié, M.—Un grand écrivain régionaliste: Emile Pouillon (1840-1906). *Paris*: Mercure universel, 1933. 57 pp. Fr. 10.

Cohen, G.—Essai d'Explication du Cimetière marin; préface de P. Valéry. *Paris*: Nouv. rev. fr., 1933. 115 pp. Fr. 12.

Corneille.—Cinna, éd. A. Cordier. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1933. 112 pp.

———. *Horace*, éd. A. Cordier. *Ibid.*, 1933. 126 pp.

Cyrano de Bergerac.—L'Autre Monde, éd. F. Lachèvre. *Paris*: Garnier, 1932. lxvi + 325 pp. Fr. 12.

Debès, M.—L'opuscule de Fontenelle inti-

ulé: de l'Origine des fables. *Paris*: Leroux, 1933. 20 pp. Fr. 5.

Delacour, A.—Pascal et notre temps. *Paris*: Messein, 1933. 160 pp. Fr. 15.

Desbordes-Valmore, M.—Poésies complètes, éd. B. Guégand. T. 2. *Paris*: Eds. du Trianon, 1932. 417 pp.

Des Granges, Ch.-M.—Les Poètes fr. (1820-1920). *Paris*: Hatier, 1932. 510 pp.

———. *Les Romanciers fr. (1800-1930)*. *Ibid.*, 1932. 576 pp.

Des Granges, Ch.-M. et Towles, Oliver.—Hist. de la civilisation fr. *New York*: Prentice-Hall, 1933. xxi + 473 pp. \$2.75.

Drain, H.—Nietzsche et Gide. *Paris*: Eds. de la Madeleine, 1932. 259 pp. Fr. 15.

Dumesnil, R.—Guy de Maupassant. *Paris*: Colin, 1933. xii + 252 pp. Fr. 20.

Dunan, R.—La philosophie de R. Boylesve. *Paris*: le Divan, 1933. 104 pp. Fr. 18.

Dupiré, N.—Jean Molinet, la vie, les œuvres. 2 vol. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 370 + 145 pp. Fr. 50.

———. *Etude crit. des ms. et éds. des poésies de J. Molinet*. *Ibid.*, 1932. 146 pp.

Durry, M. J.—En marge des Mémoires d'outre-Tombe. *Paris*: le Divan, 1933. 160 pp. Fr. 30.

———. *La Vieillesse de Chateaubriand (1830-48)*. 2 vol. *Ibid.*, 1933. 600 + 548 pp. Fr. 120.

Ehrhard, J. E.—Le Roman fr. depuis Marcel Proust. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1933. 256 pp. Fr. 12.

Escholier, R.—La Place royale et V. Hugo. *Paris*: Firmin-Didot, 1933. 195 pp. Fr. 15.

Fabureau, H.—G. Apollinaire. son œuvre. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1932. 96 pp.

Ferval, Cl.—Mme Du Deffand. *Paris*: Fayard, 1933. 415 pp. Fr. 15.

Frejlich, H.—Flaubert d'après sa correspondance. *Paris*: Malfère, 1933. 504 pp. Fr. 50.

Fromentin.—Dominique, éd. C. Navare. *Paris*: Larousse, 1933. 185 pp.

Gastard, J.—Chateaubriand. La Jeunesse de René. *Paris*: Larcher, 1933. 300 pp. Fr. 18.

Gautier, P.—Mme de Staël et Napoléon. *Paris*: Plon, 1933. 320 pp. Fr. 15.

Gautier, Th.—Les Grotesques, éd. A.-V. Pierre. *Paris*: Hatier, 1932. 80 pp.

———. *Hist. du Romantisme*, éd. L. Vincent. *Ibid.*, 1930. 64 pp.

Gide, André.—Œuvres complètes, éd. L. Martin-Chauffier. 3 vol. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. fr., 1933. xxi + 548 + xiii + 496 + xiv + 564 pp.

Goncourt, E. et J.—La du Barry. Ed. définitive, publ. Acad. Goncourt. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1933. 190 pp.

Grillet, Cl.—Un grand vigneron, Lamar-tine. 40 lettres inédites. *Paris*: Vitte. Fr. 15.

Holzheuer, A.—Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Entstehung, Funktion, syntaktischen Verwendung und Benennung des sog. "Teilungs-Artikels" (article partitif) im Französischen. Diss. Göttingen, 1930. xvi + 123 pp.

Jean d'Arras.—Mélusine, éd. L. Stouff. *Dijon*: Université de D., 1932. xiii + 337 pp. Fr. 30.

Kullmer, Gérard, and Thelin.—Fr. Vocab. drill bk. *Syracuse*: Kramer, 1933. 24 pp.

Lacour, Léopold. — Les maîtresses de Molière. Préf. de Maurice Donnay. *Paris*: Malfère, 1932. xii + 320 pp. Fr. 15.

La Fontaine.—Fables, Contes et Nouvelles éd. Pilon, Groos et Schiffrin. *Paris*: la Pléiade, 1932. x + 753 pp. Fr. 48.

Lanson, G.—Montesquieu. *Paris*: Alcan, 1932. 208 pp. Fr. 15.

Lemonnier, L.—Edgar Poe et les poètes fr. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1932. 256 pp. Fr. 12.

Maupassant.—Eight Short Stories, ed. D. S. Blondheim. *New York*: Macmillan, 1933. 189 pp. \$1.25.

Mockel, A. — Emile Verhaeren. *Paris*: Mercure de Fr., 1933. 256 pp. Fr. 12.

Molière.—Le Malade imag., éd. G. Mauger. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1933. 128 pp.

Montaigne.—Essais, éd. Strowski, Gebelin et Villey. T. 5. Lexique et index par P. Villey et G. Norton. *Bordeaux*: Pech, 1933. ix + 729 pp.

Moreau, P.—La Conversion de Chateaubriand. *Paris*: Alcan, 1933. 240 pp. Fr. 15.

Musset.—Œuvres choisies, éd. crit. de J. Thomas et M. Berveiller. *Paris*: Hatier, 1932. 701 pp.

— Poésies compl., éd. M. Allem. *Paris*: la Pléiade, 1933. 733 pp. Fr. 48.

Porché, Fr.—Verlaine, tel qu'il fut. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1933. 448 pp. Fr. 18.

Porcher, J.—Catalogue des ms. de Bossuet de la collection H. de Rothschild. *Paris*: Emile-Paul frères, 1932. xxiv + 109 pp.

Pradel, G.—Mme de Sévigné en Provence. *Montluçon*: Impr. du Centre, 1932. 216 pp.

Quinel et Montgon.—Cyrano de Bergerac et ses amis. *Paris*: Nathan, 1933. 191 pp. Fr. 11.

Racine.—Esther, éd. J. Dumarcay. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1933. 108 pp.

— Port-Royal. Etabli par G. Truc. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1933. 250 pp. Fr. 20.

Régulier, H. de.—Faces et Profils. Sou-

venirs sur Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, Laforgue, Mallarmé. *Paris*: J. Bernard, 1931. 89 pp.

Rice, H. C.—Le Cultivateur américain, étude sur la vie de Saint-John de Crève-cœur. *Paris*: Champion, 1933. 264 pp. Fr. 42. (Bibl. de la RLC.)

Riotor, L.—Barbey d'Aureville. *Paris*: Messein, 1933. 128 pp. Fr. 10.

Roman de la Rose, éd. M. Gorce. *Paris*: Aubier, 1933. 255 pp. Fr. 18.

Rousseau.—Confessions. Réveries. Ed. L. Martin-Chauffier. *Paris*: la Pléiade, 1933. x + 800 pp. Fr. 48.

Royer, L.—Bibliog. stendhalienne, 1930-1. *Grenoble*: Allier, 1932. 22 pp.

Saint-René, M.—Un grand poète: Edmond Martin. *Paris*: Grande libr. univ., 1932. 59 pp. Fr. 7.

Sand, George.—La Mare au diable et François le Champi, éd. S. Rocheblave. *Paris*: Larousse, 1932. ix + 196 pp. Fr. 10.

— La Petite Fadette, éd. S. Rocheblave. *Ibid.*, 1932. 208 pp. Fr. 10.

— La Marquis de Villemer, éd. S. Rocheblave. *Ibid.*, 1932. 231 pp. Fr. 10.

— La Mare au diable, éd. L. Vincent. *Ibid.*, 1931. 79 pp.

— La Petite Fadette, éd. L. Vincent. *Ibid.*, 1932. 127 pp.

Schwob, R.—Le vrai drame d'A. Gide. *Paris*: Grasset, 1932. 349 pp.

Seillière, E. — Le Romantisme et la Morale. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1932. 272 pp. Fr. 15.

— Le Romantisme et la Politique. *Ibid.*, 1932. 258 pp. Fr. 15.

— Le Romantisme et la Religion. *Ibid.*, 1932. 256 pp. Fr. 15.

Stendhal.—Journal, éd. Debraye et Royer. Vols. II et III. *Paris*: Champion, 1932. 525 + 512 pp.

— Mélanges de litt., éd. H. Martineau. 3 vol. *Paris*: le Divan, 1933. 378 + 363 + 447 pp.

Tchemerzine, A.—Bibliog. d'éd. d'auteurs fr. des XV^e-XVIII^es. Vols. V et VI. *Paris*: Marcel Plée, 1932. 484 + 486 pp.

Thieme, H. P.—Essais sur la Civilisation fr. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 182 pp. Fr. 15.

Villey, P.—Les Essais de Montaigne. *Paris*: Malfère, 1932. 181 pp. Fr. 12.

Violet, E.—Le Patois de Clessé en Mâcon-nais. Lexique et textes. *Paris*: Dalloz, 1932. 144 pp.

Wilma-Holsboer, S.—L'Hist. de la mise en scène dans le théâtre fr. de 1600 à 1657. *Paris*: Droz, 1933. 330 pp. Fr. 50.

Zevaës, A.—Jules Vallès. Son œuvre. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1932. 84 pp. Fr. 9.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Maria Stuarda. Tragedia in cinque atti. Con introduzione e note di A. Avancini. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1932. 98 pp. L. 2.75. (Collana di cultura classica.)

Aliquò Lenzi, L.—Domenico Carbone Grio. *Reggio Calabria*: Tip. "Fata Morgana," 1932. 32 pp. (Municipio di Reggio Calabria; letture mensili alla Biblioteca comunale.)

Allodoli, E.—Storia della letteratura italiana, ad uso dei licei classici e delle persone colte. *Milano-Palermo*: R. Sandron, 1932. 536 pp. L. 22.

Amendola, A., e Caracciolo, M.—2000. Arte, letteratura, teatro futurista. Movimento futurista di Puglia. Numero unico, diretto da —. *Bari*: S. E. T., Soc. edit. tipografica, 1932. 46 pp. L. 5.

Antona-Traversi, C.—Gabriele D'Annunzio. Curriculum vitae. Vol. I: 1863-1910. *Roma*: Casa del libro, 1932. 204 pp. L. 12.

Asinelli, P.—L'amore, l'odio, il dolore nel Canzoniere di Cecco Angiolieri. *Bobbio*: Tip. A. Bellocchio, 1932. 31 pp.

Barillari, B.—Motivi di critica. *Bari-Roma*: F. Casini e figlio, 1932. 88 pp.

Bassi, Ottavia.—Gasparo Gozzi. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1932. 175 pp. L. 7.50.

Bianchi, L.—Due accademici Salodiani del cinquecento: Bongiani Gratarolo, Giuseppe Milio Voltolina. *Brescia*: Scuola tip. Figli di Maria Immacolata, 1927. 62 pp.

Bozzi, C. L.—Una lettera inedita del Metastasio al conte Sigismondo d'Attans di Gorizia. *Gorizia*: Tip. Paternolli, 1932. 11 pp. (Nozze De Rinaldini-Zancan, 1932.)

Bracco, Roberto.—I pazzi di —. Giudizi e appunti di scienziati, di critici, di cronisti. *Palermo*: R. Sandron, 1933. 61 pp. L. 1.

Brognofigo, G.—Matteo Bandello; 1485-1561. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 122 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

Buonarroti, Michelangelo.—Le Rime. Con prefazione e note di A. Foratti. *Milano*: R. Caddeo e C., 1931. 175 pp. L. 4. (Collezione universale di letteratura, arti e scienze, no. 24-25.)

Buonocore, O.—La Madonna nella Divina Commedia. *Napoli*: Tip. Portosalvo, 1932. 44 pp. (Biblioteca de "La cultura," XIII, no. 144.)

— La porta dell'Inferno. *Porto d'Ischia*: Tip. dell'isola d'Ischia, 1931. 39 pp. (Biblioteca de "La cultura," no. 141.)

Busetto, N.—Scrittori d'Italia. Opere scelte, interpretate e inquadrate nella storia dell'estetica, del gusto e della letteratura, da —. Vol. IV, parte 2a: Il Risorgimento

e l'età del Carducci; Pascoli, D'Annunzio e la letteratura contemporanea. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1932. xi + 382 pp. L. 12.

Calvi, B.—Il canto V dell'Inferno nelle versioni elovene. *Torino*: Soc. edit. Internazionale, 1932. 102 pp. L. 15.

Calzoni, A.—Per la storia di alcuni minori teatri milanesi. *Milano*: Alfieri e Lacroix, 1932. 69 pp. L. 10.

Carducci, Giosuè.—Rime nuove. Con note di A. Albertazzi e R. Serra. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1932. 422 pp. L. 9.

Carrara, E.—Da Rolando a Morgante. *Torino*: Ediz. de "L'erma," 1932. 230 pp. L. 20.

Catania letteraria. A cura della "Rivista del Comune" (VI Fiera del libro; 1932, X). *Catania*: Tip. "Il popolo di Sicilia," 1932. 76 pp. L. 3.

Cavalcanti, Guido.—Rime. Edizione rappazzata fra le rovine. *Genova*: Ediz. Marsano, 1931. 4to., 56 + xvi + 56 pp. L. 75.

Cavallotti, Felice.—Poesie scelte. Con biografia. *Milano*: Casa edit. Sonzogno, 1931. 109 pp. L. 1.20. (Biblioteca universale, no. 90.)

Cielo d'Alcamo.—La canzone, tradotta in versi siciliani da G. Mirabella. *Alcamo*: "La folgore," 1932. 31 pp. L. 2.

Consiglio, A.—Edoardo Scarfoglio ed altri studi romantici. *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1932. 214 pp. L. 15.

Cossâr Ranieri, M.—Folklore goriziano. L'amore e le nozze dei contadini. *Gorizia*: Tip. G. Iucchi, 1932. 14 pp.

D'Ancona, A., e Bacci, O.—Manuale della letteratura italiana, riordinato e annotato per licei da M. Sterzi. Vol. I e II. *Firenze*: G. Barbèra, 1932. 2 vols., viii + 689; 1071 pp. L. 16; 18.

D'Azeglio, Massimo (Taparelli).—Ettore Fieramosca o La disfida di Barletta, a cura di G. Culcasi. *Messina*: G. Principato, 1932. xii + 224 pp. L. 6. (Classici italiani e stranieri, no. 36.)

De-Bernardis Lazzaro, Maria.—La leggenda di Turandot. Note di storia letteraria. *Genova*: G. B. Marsano, 1932. 163 pp. L. 10.

De Blasi, Jolanda.—Itinerari amorosi d'Italia. *Firenze*: Casa edit. "Nemi," 1932. 89 pp. L. 5. (Visioni spirituali d'Italia.)

De Bosio, L.—The Golden Book of Italian Poetry. Chosen and edited by —. With a foreword by G. N. Trevelyan. Annotated edition. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1933. xxxii + 319 pp. \$2.00.

De Maldé, E.—Etica ed estetica Manzoniiana. Lezioni sui "Promessi Sposi." *San Casciano Pesa*: Tip. F.lli Stianti, 1932. 216 pp. L. 12.

De Sanctis, F.—Saggio critico sul Petrarca. A cura di N. Cortese. Volume unico. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1932. xii + 293 pp. L. 10.

— Gli scrittori d'Italia. Antologia critica a cura di N. Cortese. Volume primo: Il Duecento e il Trecento. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1932. 306 pp. L. 10.

De Simone, S.—Cesare Balbo; 1789-1853. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 122 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

Della Massèa, A.—Luigi Barzini. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1932. 168 pp. L. 10.

Doni, Anton Francesco.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da M. Puccini. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1932. xiv + 305 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 58.)

D'Ovidio, F.—Versificazione romanza. Poetica e poesia medioevale. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1932. 2 vols., 317, 322 pp. L. 40. (Opere, no. 9, 9^a.)

Età, L', eroica del "Guerin Meschino." Col proemio di Polifilo. *Milano*: A. Cordani, 1932. 105 pp. L. 8.

Fago, Lilia.—Leonardo. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1932. 185 pp. L. 6.

Fichera, F.—I poeti del popolo siciliano. A cura di —. Vol. II. *Milano*: Ediz. "Corbaccio," 1932. 411 pp. L. 15.

Forino, M.—Origine e sviluppo della poesia civile in Italia. Dalla Divina Commedia al Romanticismo. *Avellino*: Stab. tip. Labruna, 1932. 28 pp.

Fratini, D.—Estetica letteraria di Mazzini. *Bologna-Faenza*: "Polemica," 1932. 182 pp. L. 7.

Gamarin, G.—Niccolò Tommaseo; 1802-1874. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1932. 131 pp. L. 5.25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

Gerbi, A.—La politica del Romanticismo. Le origini. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1932. vii + 257 pp. L. 18. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 220.)

Giovanni da Calvoli.—Le meditazioni della vita di Cristo di un frate minore del secolo XIV. A cura di F. Sarri. *Milano*: "Vita e pensiero," 1933. xxx + 386 pp. L. 10. (Biblioteca ascetica, IX.)

Goldoni, Carlo.—Commedie scelte. Volume primo: Un curioso accidente. La sposa sagace. I rusteghi. Il ventaglio. Gli innamorati. Le baruffe chiozzotte. Volume secondo: La locandiera. Il cavaliere di spirito. Sior Todero brontolon. La bottega del caffè. Il burbero benefico. La casa nova. *Milano*: Sonzogno, 1931. 2 vols., 335, 346 pp. L. 8. (Biblioteca classica economica, ni. 40 e 42.)

—Corrispondenza diplomatica inedita.

A cura e con prefazione di R. Di Tucci. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1932. 220 pp. L. 15. (Collezione Biografie ed epistolari, no. 3.)

Guzzo, A.—I dialoghi del Bruno. *Torino*: Ediz. de "L'erma," 1932. 206 pp. L. 18.

Ignudi, S.—L'eucaristia in Dante. *Venezia*: Libreria Emiliana, 1932. 94 pp. L. 5.

Jacona, C.—Vecchi e nuovi poeti e scrittori d'Italia. *Siracusa*: "La Siciliana," 1932. 322 pp. L. 18.

Julia, G.—La donna nella lirica italiana delle origini. *Catanzaro*: Tip. edit. "Bruzia," 1932. 16 pp.

Landogna, F.—Saggi di analisi estetica. Coordinati allo studio della letteratura italiana, da —. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1932. viii + 554 pp. L. 18.

Leonardo da Vinci.—Scritti scelti, inclusi la Vita scritta da Giorgio Vasari. Introduzione e commento di A. Dobelli. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1932. 151 pp. L. 7. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, no. 37.)

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Pensieri. Moralisti greci. Volgarizzamenti e scritti vari a cura di A. Donati. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1932. 376 pp. L. 30. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 141.)

Lipparini, G.—Crestomazia italiana per i licei; con introduzioni, giudizi, analisi estetiche di —. Vol. III: Il secolo XIX. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1932. xvi + 943 pp. L. 17.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Le commedie: La Mandragola; Clizia. Introduzione e note di D. Guerri. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1932. lxiii + 142 pp. L. 7. (Collezione di classici italiani con note; IIa serie, no. 39.)

Marcellusi, E.—Sui rostri. Saggi letterari su Dante, Manzoni ecc. *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1932. 224 pp. L. 8.

Marche, S.—Il vicario di provvisione dei "Promessi Sposi": Lodovico Melzi. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1932. 228 pp. L. 12.

Martini, M. M.—Santi, poeti ed eroi: 1917-1931. Conferenze. *Genova*: G. B. Marsano, 1932. 234 pp. L. 10.

Monti, Vincenzo.—La Bassvilliana. Saggio introduttivo e commento di E. Bevilacqua. *Torino*: Società edit. internazionale, 1932. xlviii + 110 pp. L. 5. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Oxilia, A.—Machiavelli. *Firenze*: "Nemi," 1932. 64 pp. L. 5. (Novissima enciclopedia monografica illustrata, no. 26.)

Pascale, L.—Il dialetto Manfredoniano, ossia dizionario dei vocaboli usati dal popolo di Manfredonia, con l'esplicazione del significato di essi. *Firenze*: I. Conti, 1931. 135 pp. L. 5.

Porena, M.—La mia Lectura Dantis. In-

ferno: Il regno della pena eterna, IX-XVII-XXVI-XXX. Purgatorio: III-IV-VI-XV-XVI-XXII. Paradiso: III-XXIII-XXV-XXXII. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1932. 418 pp. L. 18.

Pozzoli, U.—Frammenti di vita Lecchese. A cura di A. Gilardi. *Lecco*: Scuola tip. edit. dell'Orfanotrofio, 1932. 350 pp. L. 12.

Pucini, Anna Maria.—Il senso della morte nei "Sepolcri" del Foscolo. *Volterra*: Tip. C. Confortini, 1932. 20 pp. L. 2.50.

Rapisardi, Mario.—Scherzi. Versi siciliani. A cura di A. Tomaselli. *Catania*: Casa edit. "Etna," 1933. 103 pp. L. 6. (Collana storica, letteraria e folklorica siciliana: usi, costumi, arte, poesia e storia della Sicilia, no. 1.)

Restori, V.—Contro corrente. Note critiche e discussioni intorno a le origini della lingua italiana. Vol. II e III. *Mantova*: Tip. "La stampa" di C. Peroni, 1932. 2 vols., 241, 268 pp. L. 20.

Schwägerl Zuppini Fasanotti, Luisa.—Leichtfassliche Anleitung zur Erlernung der italienischen Sprache. III. Teil: Zeitwörter. *Mailand*: A. Molinari, 1932. 168 pp.

Valania, Maria.—L'abbé Galiani et sa correspondance avec Madame D'Epinay. *Milano*: S. a. "Edizioni commerciali," 1932. 96 pp. (Thèse pour le doctorat d'université, lettres, soutenue devant la faculté des lettres de l'Université de Besançon.)

Valeri, N.—Campanella. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1931. 107 pp. (Profili, no. 115.)

Várady, E.—L'Ungheria nella letteratura italiana. Conferenza tenuta alla r. Accademia d'Ungheria di Roma. *Roma*: Istituto per l'Europa orientale, 1932. 53 pp. L. 5. (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto per l'Europa orientale; serie I, letteratura, arte, filosofia, no. 23.)

SPANISH

Bertrán de Heredia, V.—Los manuscritos del Maestro fray Francisco de Vitoria. *Valencia*: 1932. 240 pp. 12 ptas. (Biblioteca de Tomistas Españoles, IV.)

Briones Ortún, J.—En torno a Balmes. *Bilbao*: Aldus, 1933. 320 pp.

Bruno, Fr.—Saint John of the Cross. Ed. by Fr. B. Zimmerman. Intr. by J. Maritain. *London*: Sheed & Ward, 1932. xxxii + 495 pp.

Camacho Padilla, J. M.—Gramática española. Segunda ed. aumentada. 2 vols. *Córdoba*: E. Sánchez, 1932. 202 y 174 pp. 12 ptas.

Cervantes.—Cinco novelas ejemplares. Ed. por J. Suñé Benages. 2 vols. *Barcelona*: Edit. Orbis, 1932. 180 y 207 hojas. 225 ptas.

Cortés, H.—Cartas de relación de la conquista de México. 2 vols. *Madrid*: Espasa-

Calpe, 1932. 240 and 248 pp. 8 ptas. (Viajes clásicos.)

Cotarelo Valledor, A.—Encol do nome de Martín Codax. *Santiago*: Nós, 1933. 22 pp.

Escritores de Chile.—Selección y notas de E. Solar Correa. Epoca colonial. Siglo XIX. 2 vols. *Santiago de Chile*: Imp. Universitaria. 123 and 248 pp.

Figueiredo, F. de.—Las dos Españas. *Santiago de Compostela*: Universitaria de Santiago, 1933. 295 pp.

Froissart, J.—Chroniques de . . . Troisième livre, publié pour la Société de l'Histoire de la France, par L. Mirot. Tomo XII, 1356-1388. *Paris*: Champion, 1931. lxxvii + 391 pp.

Giménez Caballero, E.—Genio de España. *Madrid*: Talls. gráfs. E. Giménez Moreno. 341 pp.

Girard, A.—La rivalité commerciale et maritime entre Séville et Cadix jusqu'à la fin du XVIII^e siècle. *Paris*: 1932. xvi + 120 pp. 18 fra. (De la Bibl. de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Hispaniques.)

Jiménez, J. R.—Poesía en prosa y verso (1902-1932). Escogida por Zenobia Camprubí. *Madrid*: Edit. Signo, 1932. 133 pp. 2.25 ptas.

Kullmer, C. J., Aikin, E. D. and E. Thellin.—Spanish Vocabulary Drill Book. *Syracuse, N. Y.*: Kramer, 1933. 24 pp. \$0.40.

Larra, M. J. de.—Vita spagnuola dell'Ottocento. Articoli scelti. Testo, con traduzione e commento di A. Gasparetti. *Palermo*: Ed. Andò (s. a.). 4 ls.

Lo Cascio Loureiro, H.—Historia de Madrid (Episodios, 1561-1932). *Madrid*: Imp. del Comercio, 1932. 175 pp.

Malaret, A.—Por mi patria y por mi idioma. *Cádiz*: Cerón, 1932. 31 pp.

Morawski, J. D.—Literatura hiszpanka. *Warszawa*: Trzaska, Evert i Michalski, 1933. 330 pp.

Reis Gomes, J.—Três capitais de Espanha. Burgos, Toledo, Sevilha. *Funchal*: 1931. 171 pp.

Sainz de Robles, F. C.—Castillos en España. Su historia. Su arte. Sus leyendas. *Barcelona*: Gil, 1932.

Short Spanish Stories.—Ed. by M. A. DeVitis. *New York*: Appleton-Century, 1933. vii + 209 pp.

Torró, A.—La Pedagogía científica según Luis Vives. *Barcelona*: Casals, 1932.

Vasco, E.—Treinto mil cantares populares. Tomo III. *Valdepeñas*: Imp. de Mendoza, 1932. 400 pp.

Vera, F.—La cultura medieval española. Datos bibliográficos para su historia. Tomo I (A-G). *Madrid*: Góngora, 1933. 362 pp. 25 ptas.

1933

iajes

ne de

2 pp.

as de

XIX.

aria.

añas.

l de

sième

re de

1356-

vii +

paña.

reno.

le et

'à la

vi +

e des

verso

Cam-

3 pp.

d E.

Book.

\$0.40.

Otto-

zione

: Ed.

Ma-

Imp.

r mi

nska.

1933.

anha.

1931.

es en

endas.

M. A.

1933.

según

lares.

doza,

afola.

toria.

1933.